

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. LI, No. 13
WHOLE No. 1291

July 7, 1934

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

EDITORIALS: Note and Comment.....	289-293
TOPICS OF INTEREST: The Basis of Catholic Action by James D. Loeffler, S.J. —On Unscientific Unbelief by Kenton Kilmer—July 4, Before and After by Lawrence J. Lucey—The Challenge of Catholicism by Benjamin L. Masse, S.J.....	294-300
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF by The Pilgrim.....	300-301
POETRY: Sacrament	301
ECONOMICS: The Silk Dress by John Wiltbye	302-303
EDUCATION: Adult Education by James A. Fitzgerald, Ph.D.....	303-305
LITERATURE: A Plea for Real Critics by Francis X. Connolly.....	305-306
REVIEWS OF BOOKS ...307-309.. COMMUNICATIONS ...309.. CHRONICLE ...	310-312

The Legion of Decency Marches On

THE Cincinnati meeting of the Catholic Bishops' Committee on Motion Pictures finally woke up the somnolent press and made the whole country sit up and listen. With appreciation also Catholics hailed the support of the Protestant and Jewish bodies that announced their adherence to the good cause. It is no wonder that the film industry lifted its head from the sand and realized that its life was in danger. For years the religious press, Catholic and Protestant, has hammered at unclean movies; and many religious bodies have taken more or less effective action to abolish them. But the Catholic drive, with its Legion of Decency and its simple and understandable Pledge of Decency, had the happy result of crystallizing the efforts of all good people to the common end of getting results.

For us it is important that unity be maintained under the leadership of Archbishop McNicholas and his committee, and so the terms and implications of their statement, analyzed elsewhere in this issue, must be well understood. It was a happy circumstance that the Cincinnati meeting was attended by two excellent Catholic laymen, Martin Quigley and Joseph I. Breen, representing the industry, for so the facts about the industry could be explained by men who appreciated the Bishops' case, and a clearcut understanding of that case could be carried back to the industry. It is just to say that great good has already been created by this fair procedure.

In the first place then, the industry has refitted its own machinery to enforce the code of morality, and this move has been viewed "with favor" by the Bishops, who have expressed the hope that it will now work. This was imperative, for the Bishops rightly have no intention of assuming personal responsibility for the character of the

films produced; that responsibility has been thrown back where it belongs: on those who make the films. The reinforced board set up under Mr. Breen will impose the industry's responsibility. When its findings are challenged, the matter is out of Hollywood's hands, and it goes to the Board of Directors in New York, which will then collectively bear the odium of releasing any picture rejected by Mr. Breen. One of the principal things Mr. Breen will have to do is to apply the moral injunctions of the production code of 1930, which is the rule of morality for the industry, and to interpret it to men who have little or no knowledge of morals, and whom it is impossible, however desirable, to dislodge from their positions to any extent.

Secondly, the Bishops let the industry in ringing terms know of their unchanged determination to make every effort to continue the Legion of Decency and to spread it "to every town and city in the United States," thus keeping up a relentless pressure on Mr. Breen's board to secure full and prompt acceptance of the production code. This, too, is imperative, if that board is to have any effect at all in its relations with the industry. It was only by the Pledge of Decency that the industry was at last brought to take our protests seriously, and it will be only by the Pledge that it will ever take the code seriously. It was because we had no such united pressure in concrete form in the past that the code did not work. Now that we have it, it must be used to the utmost.

It is, therefore, pretty low journalism for such papers as the Scripps-Howard chain to claim that our object is censorship. It is true that if our campaign fails, censorship will surely come; but to attempt to discredit and belittle a sensible and practical plan to have our entertainment clean, is unworthy of our press. If censorship comes when all other measures fail, it will be the fault of

the industry itself and its false friends on the press, not the result of any Catholic drive for it. But these measures will not fail if we do our duty.

What is our duty? In accordance with law and precedent the manner in which each Bishop in his diocese introduces and operates the Legion will be left to his own discretion of the best means to secure our ends in his locality. The Bishops' Committee took no stand on the question of publishing white or black lists of pictures. Already, however, nineteen diocesan newspapers are printing for the guidance of their people lists of pictures found objectionable, most of them the list sent out by the *Queen's Work*. Several are also printing the approved lists prepared by the Motion Picture Bureau of the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae. This healthy liberty and variety is one sure way to have each group or region do its own job in the most effective way.

The Bishops say: "Our Catholic people are counseled that in the long run the desired results of a wholesome screen can be assured only through unfailing opposition to evil motion pictures." And they conclude: "And thus it is hoped that the Catholic Bishops may be relieved of what otherwise would be the imperative necessity of continuing indefinitely and of extending the campaign of protest." With that ringing threat, they leave the next move to the motion-picture industry.

The Racketeer Union

WE observe with keen pleasure the progress of reform in some New York labor unions that not long since seemed to be beyond reform. Some days ago a union composed of motion-picture-machine operators decided that it could get on very well without the services of its "chief organizer," whose salary was \$18,200 per year. Hence the union abolished the office, transferring whatever duties may have attached to it, to the president, whose salary is \$1,800. The stipend of the former "chief organizer" was much higher, but it ceased when that gentleman went to Sing Sing to begin a sentence for coercion practised on members of his union. Other reforms recently introduced in this particular union include a reduction of assessments and fees, and the election of all officers by secret ballot.

It is regrettable that these reforms were instituted by the district attorney and the courts rather than by the union itself. Still, there is some excuse, since the hold of the rascals was so strong that the respectable members were practically debarred not only from voting, but from all voice in the work of the union. Other unions seemed indifferent, and the American Federation of Labor, for some reason as yet not disclosed, was unwilling to intervene, even though this attitude daily brought the whole cause of union labor into deeper disrepute. We are grateful for the reforms, however, even while we regret that they could not be made by the workers themselves.

As we have pointed out on various occasions, the racketeer labor union does organized labor far more harm

than the racketeer capitalist. The capitalist can generally explain his iniquity in smooth concealing terms, but the offenses of the union are set forth without palliation, on the front pages of our newspapers. What those officials, in the unions and in the Government, to whom labor's cause is now committed, should lose no time in doing, is to suppress, in the general interest, the labor union that plunders the worker and brings his cause into disrepute.

Abandoned Churches

THE application of modern statistical methods to church membership and attendance now and then brings out a collection of startling facts. For the last four years, Roger Babson, well known for his statistical reviews of commerce, has been conducting a study of attendance at 1,000 Congregationalist churches in every part of the United States. He reaches the conclusion that about seventy per cent of the pews in these edifices are vacant every Sunday. The highest percentage of attendance, seventy-one, is found in the rural districts, and the lowest, thirty per cent, in cities with a population in excess of 50,000. Finally Mr. Babson estimates that only about one Protestant out of every ten regularly attends the services of his church.

There is nothing in these figures to fill the Catholic observer with elation. If these defections meant conversions to the Catholic Church, we could feel happy about them, but they mean nothing of the sort. As a whole, making allowance for transfers to other denominations, the figures indicate that these defections imply loss of all faith in Christianity, or practical indifference to its teachings, and, in some cases, actual hostility to every form and type of religion. Surely, it is preferable that the bulk of our people profess some allegiance to Christianity, even to a form that is defective and, in some of its vital phases, positively at variance with Divine Revelation, than that they have no contacts whatever with religion. Mr. Babson's figures are another series of links added to the long chain of evidence that we are no longer a Christian people, but, in fact, a race of indifferentists and practical atheists.

It would be more than interesting, it would be profitably instructive, could the same methods be applied to the attendance in our own churches. Incomplete local surveys have been conducted from time to time, but the magnitude of a task that presents many inherent difficulties, has discouraged research workers in this field. It may be said, however, that there is a growing feeling among pastors of long experience that the attendance at Mass on Sundays in our large cities is smaller than it should be. Even when allowance is made for those who are legitimately excused, the conclusions are not always encouraging. When a parish with an estimated population of 10,000 reports an average attendance at Mass on Sunday of about 6,000 some suspicion of the 4,000 who do not attend seems to be justified. At least, it indicates a condition that should be investigated. The thousands who not only attend Mass, but receive Holy Communion Sunday after Sun-

day, rejoice the heart of the zealous pastor, but his happiness does not remove his fear that some of his sheep are lost in the desert.

If the figures reported by the "Catholic Directory" are even approximately correct, we have no reason to feel proud of the conversions recorded for 1933, for they number only 49,181. It is admitted that these statistics are incomplete, since they contain no returns from New York, Chicago, and several other dioceses, but allowing for these localities, it may be possible that the conversions are balanced by the defections. The survey brings before us in a vivid fashion the necessity of following the Holy Father's exhortation to work and to pray for the defeat of atheism and irreligion now growing strong throughout the world. One of the best ways of confounding irreligion is to take care that in our own lives we give the world a proof of the holiness of the religion which we profess. What we say means little, but our example can be, and usually is, a powerful argument against irreligion.

Profits and Armaments

THE plan to eliminate all large profits from industry during time of war, proposed two weeks ago by Bernard Baruch in an address before the Army Industrial College at Washington, has attracted much attention. At the same time, it has been gravely misunderstood. Mr. Baruch's proposal dealt with industry in general, but not specifically with the manufacturers of munitions, and he believes that the plots now being formed to bring on war in the supposed interest of prosperity, could be broken by establishing Federal price control, and laying larger Federal taxes, in the event that hostilities become imminent. Certainly, as Mr. Baruch remarks, we cannot again ask men to risk their lives on foreign fields of battle, while the bulk of the population remains at home to profiteer.

But is war imminent? It can be said with certainty that practically every first-rank nation in the world is speeding up preparations as if war were inevitable within another year. Inability to meet the costs of the last war acts as a check upon none. Within the last few weeks, France has voted an additional three billions of francs for "national security"; armaments are discussed on every street corner in Germany; Great Britain plans to bring her air forces up to the strength of France; and Italy is beginning to construct two 35,000-ton battleships. As for ourselves, Congress has authorized a five-year plan of naval construction. Thus a world in the trough of the worst economic and financial depression known to history can still find plenty of money to prepare for another war from which, as from the World War, all the participants will emerge crippled. Viewed from this angle, the proposition which Mr. Baruch intimated rather than directly expressed—that since war is inevitable we must cut down the profiteers as far as possible—seems to rest on solid evidence.

Nor is the scene brighter when we consider the long-sought-for limitation of naval armaments. The agree-

ments made at Washington in 1922 and at London in 1928 will expire at the end of December, 1935. Whether they can be renewed, and made a real force for genuine limitation, depends very largely, as Walter Lippmann has pointed out, upon the attitude of Japan. That country will probably insist upon a naval force as large as our own or Great Britain's, but that parity, as Admiral Pratt has explained in an article in *Foreign Affairs*, would be equivalent to the control of the Pacific by Japan. That this preponderance would be conceded either by ourselves or by Great Britain is exceedingly unlikely.

Here, then, is one source of discord, sufficiently grave, but there are others. Germany, unless the political forces now controlling that country are overturned, will demand a considerable increase in naval as well as in military armaments, and Germany's demands are presented at a time when the other Powers have settled upon plans which do not include a re-armed Germany. Finally, there are disagreements that may easily become serious between France and Italy on the balance of power in the Mediterranean. On the whole, all signs point to a race in armaments rather than to limited armaments.

Back of all these miserable possibilities lies the avariciousness of men and nations. As Henry Ford remarked not long ago, war is popular because plenty of people make money out of it. It is plain that every Government must take steps to destroy the profit motive in war, even if that means the confiscation of the munition factories and of mills in the heavier industries.

Business or Profession?

IN an address at Newark last week, James P. Warburg told several thousand college students assembled for a vocational conference that banking as a business was ended. But he hoped that banking as a profession had just begun. Almost at the same time, C. W. Wickersham, of the New York Bar, and Chief Justice Hughes expressed the opinion that the bar at large had not as yet succeeded in bringing the profession of law back to the high ideals which at one time it had enshrined and revered.

These open confessions are signs of the heart-searching crisis through which we are passing. It must be candidly admitted that the first quarter of the century, with its enormous expansion of trade and commerce, infected the professions and led them to adopt some of the lowest practices of business at its worst. The trade of buying and selling to make a profit is perfectly legitimate when conducted in accord with the principles of justice and charity; but under the laissez-faire system business, as a whole, tends to pay no heed to charity, and to justice just as much heed as is prescribed by loosely drawn statutes which any clever and unscrupulous lawyer can easily, and legally, circumvent.

While the profit motive is wholly proper, when kept within due bounds, it is out of place in a profession. Business, in fact, is differentiated from a profession by the absence or presence of this motive. The ideal of

the profession is first to give and to serve, and only thereafter to seek legitimate recompense. The physician or the lawyer whose first care is to fix the size of the fee and to get it is unworthy of his great profession. There are physicians and lawyers of that type, and too many of them, but as a whole both professions have lived up to their ideals.

We are told on the highest authority conceivable that the workman is worthy of his hire. From this injunction, the lawyer and the physician must not be excluded. Physicians in particular suffer from their willingness to attend patients who can, but do not, recompense them. Some people who would not dare defraud the landlord think nothing of declining to pay reasonable medical fees. They know that the landlord will oust them, but the physician will always come when sickness calls.

Note and Comment

Versailles In Cincinnati

THE Decency Drive has interested millions of film patrons. But—and this is the important question—has it affected the industry itself? Well, during the recent Bishops' meeting the picture people offered a new plan for self-reformation. Here are its provisions, and also what the Bishops said about it. On the part of the Industry: (1) *The Hollywood Hays office receives augmented powers.* Hitherto the Hays representative had no important powers of veto. Under the new plan he will exercise wide judicial and executive powers. He alone will pronounce upon code violations. He will have almost absolute power to forbid any picture—entirely or in part. Thus Joseph I. Breen, a Catholic, will be virtual dictator of future film morals. (2) *The Hollywood jury system cedes place to a New York court of appeals.* Under the old system, now abolished, every morals dispute between a studio and the Hays monitor went before a local jury of three producers, who naturally stood by each other. In future, on any rejected film, Hollywood has no more to say. Decision will be made in New York by the Board of Directors of the organized industry. (3) *If this works, in future all films will be unobjectionable.* On the part of the Bishops: the Committee views this plan *with favor*, is disposed to render encouragement and cooperation, hopes for the achievement of promised results. However, it insists that a clean screen can be assured only through unfailing opposition to evil pictures. Hence it will *continue the Decency campaign* and extend it to every town of the nation. To maintain and forward the movement it establishes a committee of priests, at present five in number.

Everybody's In It Now

ONCE more we are able to report in this place the impressive progress of the Decency Drive. Since our last issue the clean-films fight has become first-page

news. The Federal Council of Churches met in New York City, issued a wholehearted recommendation of the Catholic campaign, and asked all Protestants to sign—or at least to observe—the Legion's pledge; also it announced plans for the formation of an active council in every town of the nation to guide Protestants in pledge observance; and the formation of a review board, which will see the films as they come from the studios, pass upon their morals, and make known its findings to all the local units. Previous to this important Protestant move, the headlines told how the Jews of the country had entered the campaign, too, with the Central Conference of American Rabbis, largest rabbinical organization in the world, meeting at Wernersville, Pa., to commend the League, and vote cooperation. Meanwhile, the Catholic Daughters of America reported that they had enlisted more than 1,000,000 families. At the same time the diocese of Lincoln got under way. So did the diocese of Erie. More than 20,000 Brooklyn Catholics signed the pledge through the *Tablet*, and New York, by appointing a local leader, prepared to enter the fray.

Newman Club Baccalaureate

AN interesting ceremony of unusual character was held in the White Plains, N. Y., Church of St. John the Evangelist, on June 17, when the Baccalaureate services of the Newman Clubs of the public high schools was held there. The Newman Club movement was inaugurated only last Fall to teach religion to the boys and girls of these high schools, and this purpose was held to throughout the year. Meetings were held weekly, and doctrines like those of the Incarnation, the Infallibility of the Pope, and the Divine nature of the teaching Church were explained and discussed. A feature of these courses in Christian doctrine was the appointment of six boys and girls each week for open-forum discussions, and the students themselves gave talks on the Mass and the Sacraments. Even the teachers of the public high schools attended the sessions, as they themselves avowed, to learn more about their religion. The point of the whole system was that the students were not merely passive hearers, but took part themselves in the instruction. The four White Plains parishes have more than 600 boys and girls in the high schools, and in their first year the Newman Clubs gathered in more than 350, with the promise of 500 next year. It is an excellent sign of the times that our clergy are realizing the necessity of bringing the influence of the Church to bear on the religious training of the children of those parents who cannot or will not send their children to Catholic high schools.

Threats to German Catholicism

WRITING in the *Commonweal* for June 29, George N. Shuster utters a warning over the prospective fate of German Catholicism. "The time will come," says Mr. Shuster, "when the tradition of the German intellectual will be lost, and I, for one, fail to see in what

other country it can be carried on." AMERICA's editorial page in the issue for June 23 expressed alarm over the plight of the exiled German Christians, and over our apathy in their behalf. Mr. Shuster alleges some serious grounds for his own fears. "During the past few months," he says, "the doom of the German Catholic press has been sealed. Acts of outrageous suppression have followed one another." In his opinion, and as a result of his personal observations in Germany, the retaliatory boycott undertaken by the Jewish agencies is "seriously harmful to German Catholics." And the ensuing distress will have the effect of turning them bitterly against the Jews as authors of the boycott. "We cannot expect," says Mr. Shuster, "any good to come to the Church through the economic reprisals in vogue for the past twelve months. The end of such a war—for it is a war—can only be ruin and desolation." Says the German Catholic leader, Prof. Dr. Dietrich von Hildebrand: "Our reaction to National Socialism is an unavoidable test, for us Catholics, of our true attitude towards Jesus Christ." Our reaction to the situation created by National Socialism is likewise such a test. What can be done? Official protests, in Mr. Shuster's view, are worse than useless. But spontaneous expressions of sympathy and spontaneous acts of generosity towards those persons, now stranded on inhospitable international rocks, will help. In comparison with what the Jews have been doing not for their own alone, but for the Christians as well, that which is needed of American Catholics is slight. Thought, as Mr. Shuster suggests, may yet devise as to how that little may be afforded.

Children Of Russia

AMONG other projects that the depression interfered with, was the scheme of sending "good-will bags" from the public-school children of the United States to the children of foreign countries. The children of Japan, later of Mexico, were thus favored. Contents of the bags have doubtless long since been used up; and there is now no ascertaining of their psychological effects. A good-will plan of another kind, however, has been devised which Catholics can carry out; and which will bring to those who most need it succor vastly more precious than a few pencils and a handful of candy. In 1931 the Rev. Henri Deville, a priest in the parish of Hermance in the Diocese of Geneva, Switzerland, conceived the idea of a universal children's Communion on behalf of the children of Soviet Russia. He was moved to this by what he had learned of the ruin of soul and frequently of body to which these miserable little ones are exposed. The plan met with the enthusiastic approval of Msgr. Besson, Bishop of Geneva, and the cooperation of the parish priests of the Diocese. May 8, day of the first Communion of St. Thérèse of the Child Jesus, was adopted for the practice. The movement spread to other dioceses, and met finally with the warm approval of the Holy Father himself. To wait until next May 8 is now a long time. Could not Catholics in the United States anticipate that date by arranging for a general Holy Communion of our

children on the occasion of the International Eucharistic Congress at Buenos Aires in October? The Feast of the Little Flower, October 3, might be selected as appropriate for this great act of sacramental intercession. It would serve to recall to people the significance, too readily forgotten, of the prayers for Russia after every Low Mass.

Clouding The Issue

ONE of the curious by-products of the campaign for decency in the motion pictures has been the attitude deliberately assumed by the Scripps-Howard papers. They are apparently bent on manufacturing an artificial issue for the purpose of discrediting the whole campaign. It all began on the New York *World-Telegram's* woman's page. The editor of that section, one Gretta Palmer, opened the firing by invoking the "ideal" of the separation of Church and State, which by some strange logic she imagined had something to do with it. Somehow or other she got it into her head that we are threatening the motion picture with censorship. If she knew anything at all about the matter she was dealing with, she would have known that we are campaigning for just the opposite. But she discourses fluently, if illogically, on the impossibility of legislating morals into people, etc., etc. Our advice to the good woman is to read the papers, so that she may learn something about the subject before she starts to lecture us about it, because at present she doesn't know what it is all about. But Scripps-Howard do. The follow-up was on the editorial pages the following night. The old bogey of censorship was flaunted again and we must give the editorial writers the credit at least of knowing what is going on. "Demand for censorship," the editorial begins, "is seething. The churches—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish—are moving in great force on Hollywood." The strategy is puerile and mean. Nobody wants censorship; so "the churches"—including the well-known Jewish church—must be wrong. Heywood Broun was put up the same night on the same camouflage of censorship. But Heywood overdid it, as usual. He proved too much; he wants more and more sex, and all inhibitions removed. It is about time that Catholics realized that Scripps-Howard are out to destroy Christianity, and are not too nice in the means they choose to accomplish that nefarious purpose.

AMERICA A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

PAUL L. BLAKELY	WILFRID PARSONS Editor-in-Chief	JOHN LA FARGE
GERARD B. DONNELLY	FRANCIS X. TALBOT	DANIEL BASSETT
	FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN	
	Associate Editors	
	FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager	

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:
Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: MEdallion 3-3082
Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The Basis of Catholic Action

JAMES D. LOEFFLER, S.J.

A TRAVELER returned from Europe, with whom I have recently discussed the subject of Catholic Action, left me with this reflection: "In America we talk about Catholic Action; in Europe they are working at it." A review of our recent periodical literature might indeed incline one to believe that the principal work of Catholic Action is to define Catholic Action. At the risk of lending weight to this conclusion, it is the intention of the present article to discuss some of the questions now at issue on the subject.

There are so many phases of the present movement that are new that it truly inaugurates "a new era in ecclesiastical history" (*Das Neue Reich*, January, 1929). The end is new, the characteristics of organization insofar as they are determinate are new, the universality of the call and intensity of the impulse are new, as is the formal explicitness of the mandate.

Dating from the middle of the last century, the history of the rise of this movement shows it to be directed ultimately to a solution of the social question. Father Narciso Noguer, S.J., an authority on the subject, sees in it a "reaction against the sad consequences of the French Revolution" (*"La Acción Católica,"* I, p. 27). Socialists have been quick to profit by the strength which the growing injustice of capitalistic aggression has lent to their thesis. Not radical, but insistent, the Church, through numerous pronouncements of the Sovereign Pontiffs, has been increasing the pressure of its influence in behalf of the struggling masses, who, timidly and cautiously at first, but now in the full confidence of possessing so great an ally on their side, have enthusiastically launched the Catholic movement. Today in Europe (and tomorrow, it would seem, in America) those who can most help or hinder the welfare of the Church and the salvation of souls are no longer the intelligentsia, the rich, and the powerful, but the organized masses. To these the Church directs its appeal in Catholic Action.

A quarter of a century ago Cardinal Capecehatro ("Christ, the Church, and Man") saw in the eventual solution of the social question by the Church a new apologia for future ages. Since that time progress has been rapid toward the fulfillment of his prediction. The Bishops were losing influence with the more powerful among the laity who, with few exceptions, did not trouble themselves to read or apply the social Encyclicals, while the working classes became ready apostles for the teachings of such doctrines as those contained in the "*Rerum Novarum*." Most of the ecclesiastical documents of the three predecessors of Pius XI which treat of lay organizations are also intimately linked in thought and intention with the solution of the social question.

With the advent of our present Holy Father, the doors of the social apostolate were thrown wide to the laity, the call to universal organization was issued and reiterated

many times each year, the need of the Church was set forth, and the *de jure* power of the laity in meeting it was repeatedly explained.

At the same time the spiritual aspects of Catholic Action became more and more stressed. Labor guilds, farmers' associations, seafarers' clubs, student unions, professional associations, business and trade guilds, all were needed. They could (and should) have their study clubs, study weeks, conventions, congresses, publications, and the rest. But, in addition to all these, provision must be made for the welfare of souls: retreats, days of recollection, daily meditation, pilgrimages, the liturgical movement; everything that would intensify the Catholic life of the members was given a strong impulse and made an integral, even essential, part of every Catholic Action organization. The work of the apostolate, the sanctification of every social class, could be accomplished only by the grace of God obtained by prayer and a virtuous life on the part of the apostles.

Another safeguard to the lay initiative was established in the mandate which is to be obtained from the Hierarchy. Though the Hierarchy consists of the Pope and the Bishops, the Holy Father wishes that the local organizations and individuals in their private capacity be subject to the pastors also, as delegates of the Bishops in this work.

This does not subtract from the concept of Catholic Action as a lay undertaking. The laity who, individually or organized, join themselves to the centers which either the Holy Father or the Bishops recognize as organs of Catholic Action, thereby signify that they are ready to undertake their religious action at the bidding of the Hierarchy. If the purposes for which a group was originally organized are social, charitable, educational, or the like, the affiliated organization may retain these objectives, but the work of the group becomes elevated to the plane of religious action—a true apostolate, a part of the work of the Church. The autonomy of internal organization and endeavor is retained, though new outlets for the specific work may be assigned or suggested. In all approved Catholic organizations, the function of the laity is not so much directive in the order of theory as executive in the order of practice. This is particularly true of Catholic Action.

Two classes of organizations are excluded from participation in Catholic Action: those whose ends are purely political, and those affiliated to non-Catholic associations. In the latter case, in accordance with a reply given by the Sacred Congregation of the Council dated June 5, 1929, and another of May 6, 1930, some relations may be permitted with a (religiously) neutral association, provided always that this be done only in particular cases, for merely professional affairs, with a just cause, and using all necessary precautions to avoid the dangers that

might arise from such relationships. This is an understandable corollary if we remember that Catholic Action, though lay, is a work of religion.

Truly religious societies and associations, approved by the Church and directed (unless they have a special indulgence) by the clergy, are not considered as lay organizations and hence do not fall within the scope of Catholic Action. However they have been called "precious auxiliaries" of Catholic Action insofar as they are schools of formation for devout, zealous, and well-informed leaders of the movement. The Sodality of the Blessed Virgin, from the twofold nature of its work, has been constituted the one exception in this field. The Holy Father himself designated the Sodality as a true center of Catholic Action, sharing in its benefits and indulgences (cf. *Acies Ordinata*, February, 1933, p. 29).

Organization is a principal element in the reform of Pius XI.

All those who know and live the life of today [he says] realize that there is no sort of an initiative or any activity, from the more spiritual and scientific bodies to the more material and mechanical ones, that has not the necessity of organization and of organized action [Encyclical on Catholic Action].

The Holy Father personally directed in Italy the formation of an exemplar of his ideals for organized activity. Closely following his plan are the methods adopted in the Philippines in 1925, Spain in 1926, Poland Austria, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia in 1927, Latvia, Lithuania, China, and Peru in 1928, Mexico in 1930, Argentina and Chile in 1931, etc. ("La Acción Católica," Vols. II and III).

The mind of the Pope in regard to the nature of the organization is perhaps best expressed in the following extracts from his letter to the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, November 6, 1929:

Catholic Action, having its own individual nature and particular end, ought equally to have its own special organization, unique, well-trained, and coordinating every Catholic force. . . . A plurality of concurrent organizations in the same class of citizens and a multiplicity of divergent objectives would enervate the forces of this army and risk its concord and success, an evil that must be avoided at all costs.

In countries such as Belgium and France, where existing material sufficed, it was a general principle of organization not to found new societies, but to unite those already functioning, and to form the central boards, diocesan or national, of representatives of these societies. In judging whether the existing organization of a nation or diocese is adequate, there is need to consider the end of Catholic Action—the solution of the social question and the reform of social order. As this end is largely to be attained through the working classes, the organization of these on a Catholic basis is of first importance.

Much has been left to the discretion of the Bishops, since they are in a position to view the local needs, and it is from them in any case that the mandate must come. Many individual dioceses have been thoroughly organized in accordance with the plan of Catholic Action where the Hierarchy did not deem it expedient to undertake decisive steps on a national basis. This is but natural for,

although the Church is one Mystical Body having one Spirit and one Life, if we might term the various nations and sections "limbs" of that Body, the external dangers to which they are individually exposed postulate peculiar adjustment and adaptation. From this point of view the word *ideal* as applied to the form of Catholic Action is necessarily relative in its application.

One phenomenon in connection with organization is especially worthy of note. Wherever the religious crisis has become most severe, the danger most proximate (or the popular fears most intensified—which amounts to much the same thing), the Catholic movement has tended to national unification. This unification has been both extensive and intensive; extensive, in the desire and submission of virtually all organizations to associate under common national leadership—a national Catholic Action headquarters; intensive (not necessarily consequent upon union, but sometimes anticipating it) in nation-wide pursuit of a few common objectives, and the close linking of the fibers of the national Catholic body for their attainment. The objectives sought were largely dictated by the nature of the dangers: the growing power of Socialism in Belgium, France, and Austria; the anti-religious legislation of Mexico and Spain; state absolutism in Italy and, more recently, in Germany.

The question arises whether a single national organization is not required in any case for complete realization of the plan of Catholic Action. To avoid misunderstanding, let it be said here that the United States does not possess Catholic Action in this understanding of the term. According to a reply to questions by Patrick J. Ward, published in *Catholic Action*, May, 1933, the N.C.W.C. organization does not imply such a capacity in its mandate from the Bishops. Italy, where the Holy Father himself has taken so active a part in the formation of Catholic Action, does not represent his plan in the concrete in the sense that all requires universal application. Weighty authority in Rome informs us that care must be had lest what the Holy Father says of one nation, especially Italy, be imprudently taken as a general precept.

As late as March 1, 1933, a letter from Germany says: "Catholic Action in Germany has not adopted a single form of organization but the numerous Catholic societies form Catholic Action. Only in some of the larger cities, as Berlin, has the union of those Catholic organizations been named Catholic Action." With the destruction of the Center party and the coming of the Concordat, the trend has been strongly to national unification.

In Catholic countries it has been frequently suggested that if Catholic Action had been begun earlier, the great evils that have befallen some of them could have been avoided. The formation is necessarily a slow process, largely educational. There can be no revolutionary, headlong rush into action such as radicals are wont to employ for temporary advantages. Well-informed leaders must be trained, the plans of organization carefully mapped out, and definite courses of action prepared under prudent direction. Security has been the greatest weakness, opposition the greatest stimulus, of the Catholic movement.

If there be a real danger of eventual social revolution in America, as many aver, it will find Catholics unprepared unless it is foreseen, and Catholics warned of its imminence, a full generation in advance. Only then will there be stimulated a universal response to organize, generous self-sacrifice of the majority to train and study, heroic devotion to Church and Faith which will steel souls and develop high virtue. Only by meeting the evil with their flocks thus prepared can there be confidence and peace for the shepherds themselves and a large measure of security against the very evils which impend.

On Unscientific Unbelief

KENTON KILMER

DOES the sun rise and set? Anyone, I think, might be excused, even in this day of astronomical knowledge, for saying that it does. Perhaps it is not an entirely accurate way of stating what takes place, yet it does tell what we see. Similarly, in the Biblical account of Joshua's exploit, when he commanded the sun to stand still, one might even today truthfully say that it did stand still—that it ceased, for a time, to move across the heavens. Perhaps it was really the earth that ceased to whirl—but who, then or now, could possibly be expected to tell the story that way? Yet this is a fairly typical example of the kind of criticism that has "discredited" the Bible. One may imagine the sort of critic who takes such a stand viewing a modern book of history. "He was shot at sunrise." So the book says, concerning it matters not what rebel or patriot. And that, the critic triumphantly points out, shows that the author is quite untrustworthy. The sun does not rise—the earth turns until, from a specified point on it, the sun is visible—or until the sun's rays strike that point.

And then, this matter of Jonas and the whale. There has been much acrimonious discussion about the size of a whale's throat, some pointing out that one kind of whale would be unable to swallow a man, and others pointing out that another kind would be quite able to. The killer whale, or grampus, eats young seals, a sizable animal. All I know about grampuses comes from my memory of Kipling's story, "The White Seal," in, I believe, "The Second Jungle Book." The sperm whale, my trusty encyclopedia tells me, has a throat wide enough to admit the body of a man. Whether one ever did swallow a man whole is another question, and one that need not be answered. No one seems to have noticed that neither the Douay nor the King James version says anything about a whale. One says "God prepared a great fish"; and the other, "The Lord prepared a great fish." There is no reason to suppose from these words that the like of this fish was ever seen before or since. Of course, one may simply refuse to believe in any miracles. But I don't see no p'int about that miracle any harder to believe than any other miracles. The most startling thing is not the swallowing. Anybody can be swallowed by a fish, if he chooses a large enough fish, and one accustomed to bolting its meals. The trick is to come out alive. After a

three-day sojourn in the interior darkness, life, it seems to me, could only remain by a miracle. But to stay alive is certainly no more miraculous than to rise from the dead, as did Lazarus and Christ and several others. If you want to pick out the most incredible stories in the Bible, Lazarus should surely be selected before Jonas. The body of Lazarus had almost certainly begun to decay when he was restored to life. I suspect that the story of Jonas is disbelieved because it is funny; and that is a funny reason for disbelief.

To pass on to another kind of criticism, still Biblical but not concerned with the miraculous, there is the contention that Christ did not say that He was the Son of God—that His reply to Pilate, "Thou hast said it," or "Thou hast said that I am," is an evasion of the question, or a placing of responsibility for the statement upon Pilate.

Much modern American slang originates in New York, which has a large Jewish population. Jews are recognized as the source of a great deal of this slang—as gangsters and crooks of all sorts, as song writers, cartoonists, columnists, vaudeville and musical-comedy actors, and as subjects of dialect stories, serious as well as humorous. And much of their slang is brought straight from their ancestral Hebrew idiom. Students of Hebrew tell us that "Thou hast said it" was a common expression in that language to give force to an affirmation, based on a polite assumption that whatever the person addressed said must be true. The same holds today for the exact equivalent of that phrase: "You said it."

Years ago Protestants, wishing to expose the un-Christian character of Catholic veneration of the Blessed Virgin, declared that Christ Himself, at the marriage feast in Cana, addressed her disrespectfully and harshly, saying: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" The Douay version, however, has "What is that to me and to thee?" More polite, surely. But in any case, the point of the whole story is that Christ on that occasion performed a miracle at the request of His mother, which hardly seems a repudiation of her. And the word *woman* as a form of address is not so very insulting. I have not seen mentioned in this connection the fact that a son of Hecuba, in Euripides' play of that name, addressed his mother as "woman," in an affectionate and respectful remark—a memory which is almost my only relic of a college Greek course. Even the text of the play has vanished from my possession during the few years that have passed since I struggled with it in class. Though I haven't the book now, and can't show you the passage, you, being a learned Greek scholar with an erudite library, will be able to look it up for yourself. Or bring me the book, and I'll show it to you.

The "higher criticism" is, I believe, rather out of date, and would not need to be refuted now, even were I competent to do it. Yet it may be remarked that to prove that a dogma held by the Jews was also held by other nations in ancient times is very different from proving the dogma false. One might even consider such a phenomenon an indication of its truth. The story of the deluge, to take a concrete instance not directly connected

with theology, is found in every considerable body of folklore. Commentators, working on the original assumption that there was no deluge, find in this agreement a proof of the assumption. We need not be Fundamentalists to believe it is rather an indication that there was a real deluge. It may be that geologists will find that it came from the swift melting at the end of the ice age—and it

may be that it happened some thousands of years before or after that.

The moral of these observations is that Catholics need be neither Fundamentalists, rejecting scientific discoveries that seem to contradict Biblical statements, nor Modernists, considering the Bible as chiefly allegorical. The middle of the road is level; ditches of bigotry on each side.

July 4, Before and After

LAWRENCE J. LUCEY

THE Government of the United States with Washington at its head was an innovation. It was up to Washington to establish precedents. His hands were to mould the snowball, give it a push, and then step aside. But the mind which would direct the hands of Washington belonged to Alexander Hamilton. The ever-growing snowball was destined to roll down the hill of time at a constantly accelerating pace. It rolled and grew fat. It became fatter than any other snowball ever started by a son of Adam. And no one seemed to care or know what Washington had put in the snowball. Then it crashed. And the little snowball popped out. It was examined. And it was whispered that Washington had misled his children. Some even called him a step-father.

During the summer of 1789, Washington chose his Cabinet. For Secretary of State he appointed Jefferson. Hamilton was made Secretary of the Treasury. Knox, the Secretary of War, seems to have been devoid of any theory of government, but in the meetings of the Cabinet he sided with Hamilton. Randolph was the Attorney General, and in the conflicts of Jefferson and Hamilton, he one day favored one man and the next day the other.

System clashed with system in this Cabinet.

Washington presided with gravity at these recurring Cabinet quarrels. We may see the five of them, taut and attentive under the angular light of tall windows in the dull-brown afternoons. The atmosphere was that of the court room instead of that of the Cabinet. Papers rustled; there were triumphs of statistics, catch questions and sophistries driven pitilessly into corners and slaughtered in broad daylight. The crisp staccato of Hamilton's words ran in and out among the pauses of Jefferson's Virginia drawl ["George Washington," by W. E. Woodward].

In placing a skeleton sketch of Hamiltonianism by the side of a broad outline of Jeffersonianism, the contradiction between these systems is apparent. And it is with little astonishment that we read: "A nation cannot live half-slave and half-free, neither can it live half-Hamilton and half-Jefferson" ("Jefferson and Hamilton Today," by James Truslow Adams). The basic difference between the systems of Hamilton and Jefferson was their opinion of the average individual. To Hamilton the people were a "great beast." And with impeccable logic he concluded from this premise that a strong national government was needed to muzzle the dangerous monster. Jefferson resorted to a distinction in dealing with the word that bounces from the tongues of orators. The people of Europe, because of the crowded cities in which

they lived, and the heritage of vice which they received, would destroy "everything public and private" if once granted control of the government. But in looking at America he broke the ground for a Nietzschean superman. The 3,000-mile sail across the Atlantic, with its subsequent colonization of the American wilderness, had uplifted man and made him capable of governing himself. In place of Baptism and a life of righteousness, Jefferson substituted a boat ride and hard work.

Both Jefferson and Hamilton were in favor of adopting the Constitution. (Jefferson was in Paris at the time of the adoption, but his attitude is arrived at by inference.) Hence this document must have meant something entirely different to each of them. To Hamilton it was so much clay with which he would mould a government of his own liking. And it is with little wonder that we hear Madison, the author of most of the Constitution, say that after a few of Hamilton's delicate touches the document had an entirely different significance than that which its framers intended.

Before leaving the Federal Convention, Hamilton severely criticized the Virginia Plan, which, after alterations, became the Constitution, and offered a plan of his own making. In referring to the Virginia Plan he said, the people are "tired of an excess of democracy—what even is the Virginia Plan, but pork still with a little change of sauce?" Thus we may rightfully conclude that in offering a plan of his own, Hamilton would not agree with the Virginia Plan even after alteration, for if alterations would satisfy him, why did he not propose these instead of submitting his own plan?

In order to understand the government which Hamilton believed in, we must look at the plan which he proposed at the Federal Convention. This ideal government of Hamilton offered an aristocracy of wealth. The essence of this plan is:

All communities divide themselves into the few and the many. The few are the rich and well born, the other, the mass of the populace. . . . The people are changing and turbulent; they seldom judge or determine right. Give, therefore, to the first class a distinct, permanent share in the government. They will check the boisterousness of the second.

Shortly after tendering this plan, Hamilton left the convention in disgust, and did not return until the closing days. During the interim, he underwent a decided change of opinion as to the merits of the altered Virginia Plan. In sifting the reasons for this external change of opinion,

it is well to bear in mind the character of Hamilton. He possessed an intellect which sounded the depths of a problem, and once he made a decision it is not likely that every emotionally coated tittle of evidence would shake his deep-rooted convictions. The plan which Hamilton offered was the result of years of thought by the keenest intellect of the age.

In rejecting an internal change of opinion by Hamilton, we are not treading upon a manner of action which was unfamiliar to him. He was always willing to make a concession if he saw that the success of his own undertaking depended upon it. During the Revolution, Washington had the opportunity of seizing Sir Harry Clinton in New York. But Hamilton counseled against this measure. And in response to the General's why, he said: "We should lose more than we should gain; since we perfectly understand his plans, and by taking them off, we should make way for an abler man, whose dispositions we have yet to learn."

Hamilton knew that Washington would be elected President of the new Government, and by appealing to the aristocratic leanings of Washington, he could graft the principles of his plan on to the Constitution. It required a master of subterfuge to hide an aristocracy behind the gilded veil of democracy. Yet this was the mirage which Hamilton handed out to those thirsty for liberty.

In view of the countless superlatives which have been placed before Hamilton's pleas for the adoption of the Constitution in the *Federalist*, and the closeness of the vote in most of the States, it would not be hyperbolic to maintain that Hamilton meant the difference between the adoption and non-adoption of the Constitution. The fifty-three articles which Hamilton contributed to the *Federalist* are in conformity with his views. The veil of democracy dazzled the eye while an aristocracy of wealth silently dangled overhead. With the triumph of his sophistry, Hamilton must have been convinced that the "beast" had no intellect.

The second session of Congress opened on January 4, 1790. Hamilton introduced his bill for paying the public debt ten days later. Henry Cabot Lodge says of this bill:

There is probably no single paper in the history of the United States, with the exception of the Emancipation Proclamation, which was of such immense importance and produced such wide and far-reaching results as Hamilton's First Report on the Public Credit.

The United States owed \$54,000,000. About one-fifth of this debt was owed to foreign Powers, and the remaining four-fifths was a domestic debt. Everyone agreed that the whole of the debt should be paid. The manner of meeting the foreign debt was agreeable to all. The issue centered about the manner of paying the bonds which were held by the citizens of the United States. Many of the original holders of these bonds had sold them to speculators who had bought them as late as 1789 for one-fourth of their face value. Hamilton wished to pay the speculators the full value of the bonds, while Madison suggested that the money be divided equitably between the speculators and the original holders.

There was another clause in Hamilton's bill which was

bitterly debated in the House. Many of the States owed money. And Hamilton proposed to absorb these debts into the national debt. The States which did not owe anything objected to this proposal, for they were being forced to pay a debt which they had never contracted. The total debt of the States was \$20,000,000. In April, 1790, the delegates from North Carolina cast their votes against this bill, and its defeat seemed a certainty. But Hamilton was well schooled in the English idea of compromise. Jefferson had lately arrived in New York. And as he was about to enter the President's office, Hamilton met him, and walked him "backwards and forwards before the President's office" for half an hour "pathetically painting the temper into which the legislature had been wrought, the disgust of those who were the debtor States, and the danger of secession of their members and the separation of the States" ("United States of America, Vol. I," David Muzzey). Jefferson was impressed. He invited Hamilton to dinner. And over a bottle of wine Jefferson agreed to get the needed Southern votes if Hamilton would see to it that the site of the new Capital would be in the South. By the end of the summer the whole of Hamilton's bill had become a law.

In order to meet this debt the Government had to borrow money. And this debt was to endure for at least fifty years, for Congress was only allowed to redeem two per cent of it in any year. From one of Hamilton's letters of 1780 we read: "The only certain manner to obtain a permanent credit is to engage the moneyed interests *immediately* on it, making them contribute the whole or part of the stock and giving them the whole or part of the profits." The passage of this bill showed Hamilton to be a man who wasted little time in placing his theories into the realm of actualities.

More fragments of Hamiltonianism appeared in Congress in December of 1791. A protective tariff was proposed by this genius of finance. And though this bill was defeated, it formulated an issue for politicians and economists which extends to the present day, and if appearances are not too deceiving, it will be a rallying call for some time to come.

Coincident with the protective-tariff bill of Hamilton was his plan for a sinking fund and the establishment of a mint. Both of these were passed, but the House was, as yet, too much in love with the esoteric term *liberty* to allow Washington's head to be stamped on the coins.

The last of Hamilton's important bills which came before this Congress was his plan for a national bank. This bank was "to erect a mass of credit that would supply the defect of moneyed capital and answer all the purposes of cash." The bill was passed by Congress and went to Washington for his approval. The President listened to Hamilton, who said that such a bill was authorized by the "necessary and proper" clause of the Constitution. Washington signed the bill and created a National Bank, which President Andrew Jackson later called an "octopus" that strangled the people for the benefit of bankers and their dependents.

The ultimate why of Hamilton's measures had floated

to the surface. It was his intent to protect wealth from enemies within as well as those without the nation. A line of demarcation was struck between the people of wealth and the common people. Even Washington could not bridge this yawning hiatus, for he had made wealth the ally of the Government. Parties were formed with Hamilton and Washington at the head of the Federalists, Jefferson the leader of the Anti-Federalists. The Potomac seems to be the dividing line of these parties, for only three members of Congress from the South of the river voted for the bank bill, while only one member from the North voted against the bill.

There is more in Hamilton's theory of government than history. It is the philosophy which guided our Govern-

ment until March 4, 1933. The national bank and protective tariff are not interred with the bones of Hamilton. But the ultimate why of these measures had been permitted to slumber in dust-covered books. Of this condition James Truslow Adams writes:

We practise Hamilton from January 1 to July 3 every year. On July 4 we hurrah like mad for Jefferson. The next day we quietly take up Hamilton again for the rest of the year as we go about our business. I do not care which philosophy a man adopts, but to preach one and practise the other is hypocrisy, and hypocrisy in the long run poisons the soul.

This hypocrisy will be even more vividly realized if we remember that both the Republican and Democratic parties, at their inception, adopted Jefferson's theory of government.

The Challenge of Catholicism

BENJAMIN L. MASSE, S.J.

SEVERAL years ago when the controversy over Humanism filled the pages of our magazines, Gorham Munson wrote his brilliant expository, "Dilemma of the Liberated." From the standpoint of the emancipated man—emancipated men are those who reject the dogmas of liberalism as well as those of the Church, who are skeptical of all categorical pronouncements whether they be those of Henry Mencken or Pius XI—Mr. Munson judged Humanism and found it wanting. If the late Irving Babbitt had ever answered the why, whence, and whither of human existence, he had neglected to incorporate the solution in his system. If he had evolved a technique to supplement his doctrine on the "higher will," he had likewise neglected to set it down. According to Mr. Munson, these are omissions of major importance which eliminate Humanism as a final and definite answer to the quest of the emancipated man. The unfettered will be content with nothing less than an authoritative answer to the riddle of life.

Before turning for a solution to Nietzsche's esoteric and far-fetched interpretation of Greek tragedy, Mr. Munson glances hurriedly at Catholicism. He recognizes the intellectual ability and probity of men like Jacques Maritain and G. K. Chesterton, whose "Orthodoxy" seems to have impressed him not a little; nor is he unaware of the inroads made on the European intelligentsia by the contemporary renaissance of Catholic thought. If he is surprised at the new and vigorous appeal which Catholicism seems to have for many European minds, he conceals it nicely, as becomes an emancipated man who no longer swears by Thomas Huxley or follows the evangel according to Ernest Renan. But his freedom from nineteenth-century phobias does not prevent him from believing that Catholicism as a solution is impossible to Americans because it involves "an act of too much faith," and what is more, "they feel too psychologically distant from Rome. . . ." Now all this is undoubtedly true if Mr. Munson is talking for the vast bulk of the American people, and no critic can quarrel with him for

stating the sad, bitter truth. With the racket of the Klan still fresh in our memories, as well as the antics of the clowning ex-Senator Heflin, not to mention the actual discrimination against Catholic teachers in educational circles, it is only too evident that the old prejudices have survived two centuries of "enlightenment," including a memorable Presidential election, and still exist, somewhat attenuated perhaps, today.

The reader, however, is unfortunately left with the impression that Catholicism is psychologically too distant from Mr. Munson's mind as well. This is a more serious affair. For if the emancipated continue to succumb to popular complexes, what hope is there for regenerating a sick, messy world? In a collection of satirical essays, "The Flight from Reason," Arnold Lunn, unable to find a rational explanation for the Victorian scientists' smug rejection of God, seeks a key to the solution in abnormal psychology. He attributes it to *theophobia*. In America, if we would search for an explanation of the careless rejection of Catholicism on the part of our intellectual and academic world, we would have to substitute a more clumsy word for Mr. Lunn's happy choice. We would have to speak of *Catholiphobia*.

Now I do not wish to be unfair to Gorham Munson, and the reader must not think that he is among those ignorant folk who still think that Jesuits have horns. Unfortunately, however, his description of the disease is perfect, and although he himself is only slightly affected, still I have found it necessary to use what he has written.

In addition to this emotional aversion to Catholicism, there is another attitude current in America which deserves consideration here. It is a state of mind in which a man finds himself who is obsessed by an *idée fixe*, or better still, dominated by a subconscious dogma. It will be clear that this group has not achieved the emancipation of the inquisitive young men for whom Mr. Munson speaks.

As spokesman for this position, I have selected Frank Snowden Hopkins, whose article "After Religion, What"

in the April *Harper's* was typical of this state of mind. It is this writer's contention that the generation which grew to maturity after the War has repudiated the chaos in morals and manners of the 1920's and is searching about for a new basis of human happiness. These young men want a positive philosophy, based on reason, which will enable them to lead sane, moral, and happy lives. They will have nothing to do with "religions, social or supernatural," being "too skeptical to go back to the simple Protestantism of our grandparents, to accept the weak and competitive liberalism of the modernist clergy, or to take comfort in the *rationalized superstitions of Roman Catholicism*" (italics mine).

To this confession of unbelief, or rather to that part of it which touches the Catholic Church, I call the reader's attention, for it is the key to the type of mind I am trying to isolate. Only a man who has never progressed in his intellectual life beyond the nineteenth century, beyond Huxley, for instance, or Renan, could have expressed the idea in just that way. The assumption is that Victorian science and philosophy have made the supernatural impossible for the modern mind; and that, as a consequence, it must be set down as dogma that there are no dogmas compatible with reason.

That the author is aware of this breach in his skeptical front seems improbable, since he condemns that "psychological immaturity which lies behind the worship of science as a sort of black magic which will bring about the millenium." His thinking is, in short, colored by a subconscious dogma.

In view, however, of the disrepute into which nineteenth-century thinkers like Thomas Huxley and Ernest Renan have fallen (Mr. Hopkins might profitably read Arnold Lunn's "The Flight from Reason"), it is a bold thinker who will dismiss, on nothing more than Victorian pronunciamientos, the living claims of Catholicism. Just as the Church challenges the emancipated mind to forsake emotion for reason, so, too, it challenges those obsessed by the dogmatic agnosticism of the past century to re-examine the evidence and to re-study, unbiased by any dogmas whatsoever, the bases of Christian apologetics. Indeed, so cogent is the extrinsic evidence in favor of dogmatic Catholicism when seen against the background of contemporary chaos that American thinkers must sooner or later disregard inherited prejudices and acquired dogmas long enough to consider the venerable source of integral Christianity. Let me sketch briefly its challenging position today.

Four centuries ago, a great part of Europe broke definitely with the historic Christian tradition and set out on many different, sometimes contradictory, adventures in Christianity. In the course of the colonization of this country, these multitudinous forms of Christian worship took root and flourished, until Protestantism was broken on the wheel of Rationalism. During all this time, the Catholic Church was so restricted in its activities that it could no longer exert an effective influence on the spirit and development of Western culture. The industrial revolution, which radically altered life in Europe and

America and to a lesser though by no means unappreciable extent elsewhere, arose in dominantly Protestant countries and evolved its philosophy independently of the Church. The great modern push of nationalism started and accentuated, without any compensatory element of unification, the already existing differences in nations. With this nationalistic trend the Church was, of course, in no way connected. The intellectual movements of the past two centuries—evolutionary liberalism, deism, transcendentalism, positivism, and naturalism, which, breaking successively on the stubborn shoals of human experience and practical life, brought in their train the disillusion and skepticism so prevalent among contemporary thinkers—were likewise not the fruit of integral Catholic philosophy or theology. I say *integral* expressly, for there is much truth in Mr. Chesterton's contention that modern religions and thought-movements depend for the driving force of their ideas on some one aspect of Catholic teaching seen dimly through a haze of misconception and misrepresentation, and isolated from the organic whole. Finally, as regards the breakdown in morals and social life, it is obvious that the Church is in no way responsible, since the new theories are in many instances an open contradiction and perversion of its teaching.

On all these problems, the Church challenges the modern mind. Without changing a jot or tittle of her dogma, it insists that it can solve them and in solving them restore sanity and value to human life. Such is its challenge to the modern mind. Have the "emancipated" and the "subconscious dogmatists" courage to accept it?

With Scrip and Staff

ACCORDING to Foreign Affairs for July (page 579), the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, murdered just twenty years ago at Sarajevo, had 2,057 ancestors, including 1,486 Germans, 124 Frenchmen, 196 Italians, 89 Spaniards, 20 Englishmen, 52 Poles, and 47 Danes. These figures seemed to me tremendously impressive until I began to wonder why the number of his ancestors was set at 2,057. Why not 205,700? Or 25,000,000? It is a matter of arithmetic; unless the reference was to documented forebears. Come to think of it, we have all an astonishing number of ancestors. Only where does the multiplication process stop, going backward? This is one of those unsettled questions; which will remain unsettled, because nobody's life, or bread and butter in this world, or salvation in the next depends upon it.

The question of calendar reform, which the Pilgrim touched upon once before (June 14, 1930), seems to be in this category. If it were vitally urgent, the amount of research and discussion that has been devoted to it should have brought about some conclusion by this time as to what was best to do. But the conclusion seems as far off as ever.

If the preservation of the sabbath-day problem were not concerned, the question would appear to rest with the

choice between two plans which have won the most popularity so far: the so-called International Calendar, of thirteen equal months of twenty-eight days each, one of which would be called Sol; and the so-named World Calendar, which keeps the twelve months, but by some slight readjustment in their length, and the addition of an extra weekday to the year, achieves equal quarters, and so does away with the major scandal of the present system.

THE Rev. Dr. Edward A. Schwegler, of Buffalo, has written extensively on the calendar question; and believes in the merits of the World Calendar. Indeed the thirteen-month idea seems steadily to have lost popularity as the disadvantage of an indivisible number of months became more apparent. It received, too, a heavy blow in the suicide of its chief sponsor in this country, George Eastman, of Rochester, N. Y. With the World Calendar we should have to accustom ourselves to February 30 and April 31, but otherwise would find little to startle us. The dates for a good part of the year would remain unchanged. Apart from its manifest business and scientific advantages, the clergy and the laity who follow the Mass would greet it with joy, for it would greatly simplify the Church calendar and its complicated references.

Deadly opposed to either system, however, are the orthodox Jews and the Seventh-Day Adventists, who see in the extra weekday a disruption of the sequence of the sabbath. The rest of us find it difficult to get their point of view, since Revelation, much less reason, offers no guarantee that the sequence of sabbaths has come down unaltered from the beginning of the world. But if they insist on clinging to their reasoning, which they have a perfect right to do, an element comes into the discussion which none of the calendar reformers have wished to slight: that of religious conviction. Hence until the need of a regularized calendar becomes more acutely felt, with a corresponding urgency in the matter of the common good, it will probably remain in its unsettled condition. When the present wave of nationalism passes, and world planning again holds the center of the international stage, this urgency may indeed be felt.

The Holy See, so far, has not committed itself, although it has given to understand that the consent of the Church to the fixing of the date of Easter would be a matter for an Ecumenical Council to determine. Dr. Schwegler, in his pamphlet, "Catholics and Calendar Reform," which may be obtained gratis from the World Calendar Association, 485 Madison Avenue, discusses the interesting plan of the Rev. James A. Colligan, S.J., of San Francisco, for an extra week from time to time, and the objections raised by the Rev. Henry Woods, S.J., to the idea of calendar reform.

FOR over fifty years controversy has turned upon the site of Emmaus, where the Saviour appeared to the two disciples after His Resurrection, and imparted to them the mystery of the Holy Eucharist. The argu-

ment that Amwâs, between Jaffa and Jerusalem, is the ancient Emmaus found support in the discovery there, in the last century, of the ruins of what appeared to be a very ancient Christian basilica, with three apses. Investigators, however, concluded that the ruins were merely the remains of a Roman bath or *thermae* of the sixth century, and the matter lapsed until new light was shed upon it of late by the enthusiastic researches of the two great Dominican scholars, Father L. H. Vincent, the archeologist, and Father F. M. Abel, the historian, who published their findings in 1932, in the work: "Emmaüs. Sa basilique et son histoire."

Fathers Vincent and Abel unhesitatingly placed the ruins as dating from the third century after Christ; indeed early in the third century. Accustomed as we are to hearing of the catacombs, and of the early Christian Church "emerging" from them, it is startling to learn of a complete church building in existence before 250 A.D. Yet the conclusion of Vincent and Abel was unhesitatingly endorsed, after skeptical study, by Father G. de Jerphanion, S.J., who in his long career has punctured so many an archeological bubble. In vain, says Father de Jerphanion, writing in *Orientalia Christiana* for May, 1934, would one search for such perfection in construction in the fourth or fifth centuries as is shown by these foundation stones. He adds, moreover, that the existence of large and well-appointed Christian churches at that early epoch, such as the *domus ecclesiae* at Cirta, was not as uncommon as might be imagined. Some of these earliest churches had even large annexes built on to them, for housing the offices of what was even then a complicated ecclesiastical administration.

Taking into consideration the religious toleration of the Syrian emperors, it was by no means strange that such a church would have been built as that at Emmaus. But there remains one qualm. Why is it, asks De Jerphanion, that if such lateral apses were built as are found in these ruins, this type construction was not imitated in edifices of the fourth century? Why did this mode of construction perish, only to emerge at a much later date? "Sad condition," says De Jerphanion, "of archeologists who find one question always substituting itself for another and never reach what seems to be certainty without stumbling over new problems!"

THE PILGRIM.

SACRAMENT

I will not praise you in the outworn fashion
Of bards who lie, comparing maids to stars,
Nor dwell, like some, on merely human passion
That counts all wives as cheap as Potiphar's.
Not of earth wholly, nor of heaven above,
You are composed of neither, and of each.
Oh, not for nothing God made lips for love,
But gave us something more whose yearnings reach
To Heaven through a kiss. In you all things—
Warm fragrant earth sun-strewn with fruits and flowers,
Swift tears of clouds, rustle of angels' wings
On winds of laughter, quiet of holy hours—
All meet in harmony, and mend Eve's loss
With Blessed Mary watching by the Cross.

WILLIAM THOMAS WALSH.

Economics

The Silk Dress

JOHN WILTBYE

I DON'T know anything about economics, but I do know what I don't like. It's like music, you see, or painting. For instance, there is Peter Smith who makes the school uniform which your little Mary Jane is probably wearing. Peter charges the school \$12.75 per suit, except now and then when he tells Sister Agatha that on account of his deep interest in Catholic education, he will give her a special discount. Then he charges \$10.00, the dear man. (O, yes, he is a Catholic; one of the crawl-thumping kind.)

But don't jump to the conclusion that on account of his deep interest in Catholic education, Peter is heading for the almshouse. Not he. Those suits cost Peter just \$4.90, at a maximum, and sometimes considerably less. One item is for the material, and it varies, according to the market and Peter's ability to pick up choice lots, from \$3.00 to \$4.00, but never more. The other item is for manufacturing costs, to-wit, ninety cents, and this sum goes to two sweat-shop workers. As it takes them all day to finish one uniform, your sharp mind will at once see that these women receive a wage of five and five-eighths cents per hour.

It is easy to understand the depths of Peter's interest in Catholic education. It is even easier to see that Peter is walking the primrose path at the head of which lurk Satan and his attendant devils.

That is one kind of economics that I positively dislike. There is another sort that has me puzzled. I think I understand what is at the bottom of the case, but how to mend it, destroy it, rather, is beyond me. I submit the matter to the readers of this Review for their expert opinion.

Last week I paid a visit of ceremony to my godchild. The day before, she had been to the city shopping, and one of her purchases was a silk dress. Perhaps I ought to explain at once that she has an account at two of the city's leading department stores, Oldham's and Alfred Percival's. (That is not an exact description, since both establishments resent it. They cater to a "high-class" trade in women's wear, mostly, and give all sorts of service of that useless sort in the shape of footmen to open the door for you, plate-glass-window displays, artificially cooled air, and so on, for which, of course, you pay whenever you purchase a handkerchief). But on this occasion, however, lured by tales she had heard of "simply wonderful bargains," my godchild had left the beaten path to go downtown to a shop conducted by a man named Small.

She lost out, you say? On the contrary, all that she had heard paled before the realities spread out and heaped up at Small's.

To begin with, one of the first exhibits was a replica of the dress she was wearing. Two weeks earlier she had

purchased it at Oldham's, and the price was \$34.50. Here it was at Small's in all its glory, and you could take it home for \$5.90. The dresses were displayed for my inspection, and as far I could see, the two were identical in material, cut, style, and finish. That does not mean much, since I know as little about these things as an Eskimo knows about palm-leaf fans, but my godchild, an expert in this field, assures me that the two creations are as like as two eggs. Further inspection at Small's brought before her indignant eyes a dress for which she had paid Percival \$40. Here its price was \$8.00. Incidentally, before she left, wondering, she had purchased three outfits for less than \$30.

What is the explanation?

If you put that question to Oldham or to Percival you will get an answer at once, but not an explanation. Each will tell you without hesitation, "We do not compete with Small's." The identity of answer leads me to believe that it has been agreed upon, probably under legal advice, by the shops. But why do they not compete, or, rather, why can't they?

None of the three shops I have mentioned is a manufacturing concern. Apparently, all buy these dresses from the same manufacturer or manufacturers. Whether or not all pay the same, or approximately the same, price for the goods, could be ascertained only by an inspection of the books, and these, unfortunately for our case, are not available. Naturally enough shops guard their books jealously, and even the Federal Government has its troubles getting a clear picture. A variation in price may be supposed, however, since it is claimed that Small buys in enormous quantities, and for cash, while the other shops purchase smaller quantities, and on time. What would this variation be? A field for interesting possibilities is here opened. Does Small pay \$5.00 for the garment which he sells at \$5.90, while Oldham pays \$10 and sells at \$34.50? I have purposely assumed a wide variation of the original purchase price—one hundred per cent. But, even in that case, must Oldham mark up the price by more than 200 per cent in order to show a profit?

That is possible, and if a fact, it shows the disorder in current methods of distribution. Small's shop is housed in tumble-down buildings in a cheap part of town. Oldham occupies a marble palace, stretching over half a block of some of the most expensive real estate in town. If my memory is not at fault, Oldham pays taxes on a valuation of a million dollars. This item must be added to the cost of every article sold. Again, Oldham's shop windows are the talk of the town, and to keep these in order and up to date he must maintain a large corps of window dressers. Small has no windows in his shop, except a few for the purpose of letting in a little light.

In Oldham's you find thousands of electric lamps shedding a soft indirect glow over the scene; quiet, well-trained, and numerous attendants; and managers without number. At Small's flickering tubes shed a harsh cold light over thousands of buyers who at times must be brought back to calmness by the police, and instead of quiet and numerous attendants, you see girls perched here and there on platforms, surveying the floors, like guards at a penitentiary. There are no clerks. You serve yourself, and if you have no companion, you stand on your pocketbook while you try the dress on. Otherwise, some sneak thief will get it. But I don't want to leave the impression that Small's is dirty and disorderly, for it isn't. It is simply a place in which "service" and luxury of shop fittings are reduced to an irreducible minimum. Small sells for cash only, while Oldham will accommodatingly carry your account. I should add, finally, that Small has the reputation of dealing fairly with his employees.

Now as to the moral aspects of trading at Small's instead of at Oldham's. Catholics know that they directly participate in another's sin when they directly help to make that sin profitable. Hence, if I know that a shopkeeper works on sweat-shop methods, that is, refuses to pay his employees a living wage, or is guilty of other unfair practices toward his employees, or other shopkeepers in the same line, then I may not patronize him. The reason is that my patronage helps in its degree to make his iniquity profitable, and hence encourages him to continue in it. That is clear enough, but in the present case, I do not know that I am buying from anyone who is guilty. On this ground, then, there seems to be no reason why I should pay Oldham \$34.50 for an article which I can purchase at Small's for \$5.90.

I cannot escape the fact, however,—so at least it seems to me—that both establishments buttress and support the sweat shop. Here is one indication. A friend of mine has two cousins who for years carried on a successful business of dressmaking. These ladies carefully examined a dress sold by Small for \$8.00, and reported that the material could not be purchased, in the wholesale market, for less than \$5.00, and ordinarily would cost about \$5.50. The cost of manufacture would be the wages for two days of a skilled tailoress. (I realize, of course, that "tailoress" may mean three or four workers, some skilled, some not.) With quick turnovers and an overhead at a minimum, Small does a business of over \$5,000,000 per year, of which about \$3,000,000 is profit. This is a flight into the higher mathematics, but if Small makes that profit, or anything near it, you can figure out what he pays the manufacturer for a dress to be sold at \$8.00 and how little is left for the wages of the tailoress for two days. It seems to me to be considerably less than a slave wage.

Two points stand out for further consideration in this story of the slave wage. The first is a question: how can the costs to the ultimate consumer be lessened by the elimination of parasitic middlemen and the so-called "service"? The next is this: the sweat shop still exists.

What can we Catholics do to stir up the State to eliminate it? For here we have clearly a case in which the individual can mend nothing. Hence, the State must act. But how can we set the wheels of social justice in motion?

Education

Adult Education

JAMES A. FITZGERALD, PH.D.

THE need for adult education in this country may be indicated by four kinds of illiteracy which gnaw at the vitals of our civilization. These may be characterized as: reading, physical, economic, and moral. More than 4,000,000 people above the age of ten in the United States cannot read or write. Approximately one-third of our people have one or more, more or less serious, physical defects. Many people have little understanding, for example, of money, banking, credit, checking accounts, installment buying, interest, or debt. Most discouraging, however, is the moral type of illiteracy. Dishonesty, graft, irresponsibility, and viciousness in private and public life need no enumeration or description in this paper. The daily papers give sufficient proof.

To these very disheartening weaknesses should be added another suggested by the Rev. Ernest R. Hull, S.J., in his very excellent book, "Collapses in Adult Life." Lack of emotional stability is a serious handicap. Fear, for example, is one aspect of these collapses. Fear of failure is characteristic, too, of emotional disturbances in many adults. Often these disturbances can be remedied effectively by a proper mental hygiene. Prominent educators and trained psychologists point out the very great importance of success in child education. If we train failures in the schools, is it any wonder that we find breakdowns in adult life? Yet millions are retarded and eliminated every year in our schools. Thousands have nervous and mental collapses in adult life. Thus we have need for continuation schools; accordingly, there is need for adult education if these types of illiteracy are to be eliminated.

Prof. Joseph K. Hart, of Vanderbilt University, speaking to the Chicago Conference on Adult Education held in Chicago some years ago suggested that the creation of the good citizen is the real purpose of adult education. Everett Dean Martin speaking to the same conference indicated that the interest in education today is comparable to the revival of learning in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and that each must enrich his own life of knowledge and understanding before it is possible to enlighten others properly and effectively. Surely then, adult education is the continued training in life outside the school to meet the insistent problems of life. Education should not be one-sided or narrow; it should concern the whole man. Through adult education, one should become able and willing to realize the values of life, the ends which are good for all.

This statement has two main aspects, ability and will. One may become able through training and education, but if the will is not trained, he may use his education for

ends, unworthy and degrading. On the other hand, one may have the will to do the right thing, but may lack the power and ability. Enlightened instruction concerns both the intellect and the will; training of the one and neglect of the other may be fatal.

The saying, "I am too old to learn" has been heard often. Such a statement brings up the question: Can adults learn? The answer is yes. Dr. Edward L. Thorndike in his book "Adult Learning" shows that an adult can learn approximately as well and as rapidly as an adolescent person. These findings should give courage to adults who neglected or missed opportunities in early life. The old saying, "It is better late than never," is certainly true for most of us, relative to learning. Adults have opportunity for various forms of education, training, and learning. But the question "What shall adults learn?" is crucial.

An illustration is pertinent here. Dr. O. S. Hamer, while a graduate student at the University of Iowa studied 400 Master Farmers (an honor farm organization) in twenty-eight States. Their median age was fifty-two. Two hundred had an eighth-grade education, or less. About seventy were college graduates. Thus their range of education was great, but their average education was low. According to Dr. Hamer's findings these Master Farmers gave credit for their success, first, to the reading of farm papers, bulletins, and books; second, to farm-bureau meetings and county agents; third, to experimentation and other farmers; and fourth, to special days and short courses at the agricultural colleges. Ninety per cent of these farmers reported that they had adopted the greatest number of new farm practices after they had reached the age of thirty; twenty per cent reported that the greatest number of new practices were adopted between the ages of forty-six and sixty. Truly these Master Farmers are adult learners.

What is true of Master Farmers is also true of master doctors, master lawyers, master teachers, master mechanics, master electricians, master salesmen, and master workmen in every line and trade. One must go either forward or backward in his profession.

There are many agencies for adult education, such as the radio, motion pictures, the press, and various types of schools. Many universities accommodate thousands of adult students exclusive of those in the professional schools. They offer courses in literature, speech, journalism, economics, history, accounting, education, philosophy, psychology, and religion. There are many national organizations with big programs enriching adult life, such as the American Library Association, the American Association of Adult Education, the National Recreation Association, the American Federation of Labor, the American Bar Association, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Vocational Guidance Association, and the United States Chamber of Commerce.

The main objectives of adult education as well as child education concern religion, the home, citizenship, leisure, and vocation. Contributing objectives are health, discovery of knowledge through reading, science, and so on,

and communication. We have already indicated how the Master Farmers contributed to their vocation by reading. These same Master Farmers also contributed to the home, citizenship, and leisure by reading. There is not space to describe several methods of learning; reading is sufficient for illustration. The power to read rapidly is by no means a simple matter. Great strides have been made in reading in the last few decades. Dean Gray quotes statistics from Parsons showing that in 1880 when the population of Chicago was approximately 500,000, the public library circulation was approximately 200,000, and in 1920, when the population was approximately 2,700,000, the library circulation was approximately 7,700,000. Data concerning other cities show that interest in books has increased at an amazingly rapid rate. A book entitled "The Reading Interests and Habits of Adults," by Gray and Monroe, which is the result of a study undertaken by a joint committee of the American Library Association and the American Association for Adult Learning, should be of help to every adult.

Reading is of two main types: recreatory and work-type. Dr. Horn suggests four main factors in reading: location, comprehension, organization, and retention. Every adult should know how to locate books, magazines, and bulletins in libraries by means of card catalogs and readers' guides and how to locate material rapidly in a book by skimming and by use of the index. Pitkin's book, "Art of Rapid Silent Reading," has been written especially for adults. It is an exceedingly helpful book for one who wishes to improve his technique in home study. The second factor, comprehension, is the process of getting thought from the printed page; it is, of course, a crucial skill. Lip movements are valueless unless thought is comprehended. Old methods tended to foster lip movements and slow reading; modern methods stress rapid silent reading. An adult who was taught by the old slower method can learn the new method which makes it possible to read more and comprehend better in the same length of time. The third factor, organization, is important in selecting and classifying material so that it will be of the most value in solving pressing problems. The fourth factor, retention, is closely associated with comprehension and organization. It concerns the problems of how to remember what is read. Good comprehension makes organization easy; good organization makes retention easy. Ability to locate material makes the other three factors possible. With these factors mastered, reading is not only a tool for work, but a device for culture.

One of the great problems in this country is the question of how to spend an ever increasing amount of leisure. Leisure may be a great asset, or a terrific menace to American life. Education for leisure is, therefore, a very great problem for each adult. Character is determined to a great degree by the manner in which one applies himself to his exacting work and in his leisure time. Those who have to earn their leisure by careful planning are the ones who deserve it most and use it best. Leisure may be spent in active participation or in passive lethargy; and it should be emphasized that active participation is of

greater value than passive acceptance. Tennis, golf, baseball, dramatics, music, and literature are wholesome. It is true, however, that some people have a poor comprehension of relative values and so spend all, or nearly all, of their leisure time in such an activity as bridge. They give as an excuse that it trains the mind, but the only thing for which it trains the mind is more bridge. One has no quarrel with those who play an occasional game of bridge; the truth is, however, that bridge is not relatively valuable enough to take up all of one's leisure half of one's leisure, one-fourth of one's leisure, or even one-tenth of one's leisure time. There are many cultural activities that a progressive adult cannot afford to neglect for a mess of pottage. For example, many excellent things can be read if proper guidance is obtained. There are bibliographies in science, history, psychology, philosophy, and other subjects.

An hour a day in one of these fields will do wonders both in increasing knowledge and intensifying and enlarging interests. One should learn to budget one's time; everyone must learn to guide himself. Well-selected reading will create a desire for more good reading. Poor literature, such as the sensational novel, may create a desire for more of it also. Thus careful training of one's desires and interests is necessary if one is to improve. Leisure time devoted to art, music, economics, literature, philosophy, and religion will pay good dividends in vocation, home, culture, character, and citizenship.

Literature

A Plea for Real Critics

FRANCIS X. CONNOLLY

IN the topsy-turvy of the present day, when good insurance men become presidents of universities, when professors are directors of banks and under-secretaries of agriculture, when the sole assurance of success in one profession seems to be expert knowledge in another, it is amusing if no longer strange, to witness the divorce of authority from men most capable of exercising it. An originally admirable disinterestedness, a desire to rescue thought and practice from the exclusive domination of specialists who threatened to grow inward, now appears to be a dangerous bending backwards. A radical atheist has an audience for his remarks on theology, but a theologian is considered biased when he speaks on his own specialty. We prefer to study seriously the impressions of an itinerant novelist rather than the sober researches and the moderate conclusions of a scientific sociologist. It is not surprising, therefore, that in literature we find that the scholar, the critic in the old sense of the word, has yielded his place to the reviewer.

No one, I dare say, is quite so dated as the critic of literature. While his colleagues in the physical sciences are building the reputation of their positions, aweing the public with photographs of split atoms or reproductions of prehistoric men, the literary man barely finds readers for his best analysis. Now and then he scavenges a mor-

sel of publicity by writing a guide to the work of James Joyce or Gertrude Stein, or he wreathes a garland for the centenary celebration of one of the more obscure poets. If he happens to be a university man and if his school is wealthy, he may be invited to become the sixth sub-editor of a monumental edition of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle with notes and appendix. But all in all, unless he happens to be a very remarkable genius, he receives little or no recognition at home or abroad.

Strangely enough, the situation is not unjust. The university critic, especially, has only himself to blame. A peek at the average Ph.D. thesis, or the leafing through one of the professional magazines will reveal clearly why the scholars have lost the accolade to the more vigorous if less erudite recruits from the thorny wilds of journalism. The literary man who has dedicated himself to criticism has all too frequently permitted himself to grow dull. Boring investigations of the grammar of Shakespeare or the prosody of Spenser were simply the outward signs that he had abandoned philosophy for philology, significant comment for insignificant scholarship, the meaning of the word-for-word meaning. The professor yielded to a fad quite as fantastic as the cult of incoherence when he submitted to the bondage of German literary anatomy.

We should, however, cease investigating the cause of failure and begin to search out a means of improvement. Too much energy has been spent in the analysis of the roots of decay. We usually know, all too well, why we have pedants and pundits; and we frequently mistake our knowledge of the cause to be an excuse for the effect. All our problems end in an elaborate statement of the question. Accordingly, when it has been suggested that we should renew the liaison between literary men and literature, between belles-lettres and the trade of books, between the university and the book store, someone has always been ready to explain why it is impossible. Few have realized that the liaison is necessary and hence must be possible. The day of the remote and ineffectual don must pass if American literature is to embody the sense of tradition, the dignity and the discipline which are the distinguishing marks of a permanent culture.

I am not unaware that there are enormous difficulties involved in bringing the mountain to Mahomet, and that not the least of these is the fact that there is a wide distinction between the trade of books and the art of letters. Even today, when newspaper reviewers frankly admit that they are literary reporters, not critics, there are many people who fail to understand that bookmen apply a double standard, that the tags, "supreme art," "work of sheer genius," "magnificent truth," do not mean the same thing when they are applied to the latest best seller and to Keats, any more than the motion-picture reviewer's "colossal" means the same thing when it is alternately asserted of a current superfilm and the tragedy of Hamlet. But confusion remains because the double standard is for the most part implicit. There are very few book reviewers who have the courage to preface their little dissertation on Tiffany Thayer with the straightforward pronouncement

that he provides rather shoddy entertainment; a still smaller number can resist some casual logrolling or personal bias, and only the *rara avis* will confess, if he is reviewing non-fiction, that he is not thoroughly conversant with a subject. But the average reader cannot know this. When he sees a criticism in what he assumes to be a reputable paper he takes for granted the authority of the writer.

Like the purchasers of Peruvian bonds, he is beginning to learn that much literary criticism is as honestly incompetent as the financial statements of Wall Street. He is beginning to ask why he is so consistently disappointed with highly advertised books many of which to a man of slight education are obviously hash for the public. If he happens to be mildly studious and recalls the periodical book news of ten or twelve years ago he also wants to know why the "great" books of the early twenties, "the colossal epics" of the farm and town, are so indisputably dead. He wants to know in other words when "great" is going to mean "great" again, and when axe-grinding lady novelists are going to forget the Sister Sue attitude when they review friend Eleanor's latest tantrum about life and all that.

The reviewers are not to blame. After all they are not the men of genius and virtue upon whom Swift laid the duty of mending the world as far as they are able. They are as a rule clever people who know how to make ideas, their own or other people's, attractive, even though in the process they blacken the lily or gild the pot. They cannot afford to be too indifferent or to express a rigid personal philosophy. I cannot imagine a popular reviewer as firmly contemptuous as Stanley Wilson in his article on Faulkner and the other white hopes of American fiction in a recent issue of the *American Spectator*, or as intelligently moral as Dorothea Brande in her fiction reviews for the *American Review*. The reviewer in other words does not dare set up a standard and write down a judgment. He is inevitably committed to appreciation or depreciation, to the discreet cheer or to resonant indignation. He is bound to his audience, to the vast semi-learned reading public to whom books are chiefly well-bound newspapers. This flattery of public taste has of course resulted in the coronation of the best seller and a hopeless confusion of those two separate literary qualities, entertainment and interest.

It is manifestly absurd to expect the substitution of the critic for the reviewer. We can no more do away with the daily book column because it is partly erroneous than we can suppress newspapers because they are not as accurate as secret service reports. The reviewer despite his limitations has his place. But if the critic need not supplant the reviewer he must complement him. The functions of the two do not necessarily collide. Harry Hansen performs a very important service when he tells us what a book is about and how he, as a competent representative of many thousand readers, feels about it. That is as far as he goes. The real task begins. The careful weighing of motive and effect, the judicious touchstone test, the comparison with the best that has been thought and said

follows the immediate reaction. A writer may be first in a small Iberian village and last in Rome, but it is highly improbable that the journalists in a great Iberian village like New York would ever find out about it.

How is the critic to function? Even if he had access to all the influential magazines he would still remain the single dissenter in the chorus of ayes, or the thundering yes in an empty silence. He is in the anomalous position of the protestant whose speech is made in his opponent's hall and supervised by his opponent's police. The more forceful his accusations the more powerful his position, the more he contributes to the fiction that his antagonists are very broad-minded men and that he is something of an ass to attack them.

A critic cannot play and umpire the same game. He must be independent and authoritative and the institution which he uses, the press or the lecture hall, must also be independent. There must be a bench for letters. Hitherto, even in the most disinterested magazines many brilliant opinions have resembled attorney's briefs, clearly written arguments which rarely achieve impartiality.

It appears to me that there are two ways in which an independent criticism may function, the first contingent upon the accident of genius and the second upon the accident of circumstance. America may form a new Scribblers Club. Somewhere among the writing gentry there should be three or four men secure enough in their literary position to claim and exercise authority. No one knows who they are. No one can call them together to form a literary corporation. They will be a homogeneous group, unlike the editors of the *American Spectator*, and they will believe very strenuously in enlightened tradition and right order. But we cannot unfortunately do anything about it.

The second way, while it will undoubtedly be less effective, is nevertheless more probable. Independent literary criticism should be fostered directly by American universities. How this is to be done I leave to the discretion of the gentlemen who manage them. This much at least is true; if the university offers its findings on modern municipal problems and business finance, all the more should it be ready to report on its proper field of literature. There is something anomalous, to say the least, in the spectacle of great educational institutions issuing monthly reports on industry, law and government, valuable current data better supplied by a financial press, while its literary intelligence consists in the sporadic publications of museum pieces.

If we cannot commandeer a Pope, a Gay, and a Swift to examine and castigate literary fraud, we can at least demand that the universities perform their public duty. It is their function chiefly to maintain the dignity of the art of letters against the trade of books, enlightened tradition against short-sighted enthusiasms, artistic discipline against irrational revolt. When the universities begin to operate in their spheres with the same independence and authority which the Cardinal Hayes Literary Committee has exercised within its own limits, American letters may again reap the benefits of wisdom now wasting away in libraries.

REVIEWS

France and the Establishment of the American Catholic Hierarchy. The Myth of French Intervention (1783-1784).

By JULES A. BAINÉE. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. \$2.50.

Through the writings of Gilmary Shea, B. U. Campbell, Thomas Campbell, S.J., and others, the story of the alleged French interference in the establishment of the American Hierarchy became a commonplace. To this episode, which he characterizes as an "intrigue," the Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday devotes the entire thirteenth chapter of his "Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll." John Carroll, and with him the nascent Church in the United States, are considered as fortunate in escaping the plan which would have placed American Catholicism permanently under French control—if Benjamin Franklin's suggestion had been carried out, under a French Vicar Apostolic. Against this interpretation of events, Father Baisnée has written, with scrupulous care and objectivity, a scholarly review of the documents in the case, adding another important document to those alleged by Dr. Guilday. He emphatically rejects the idea of an "intrigue." His concept is summed up in the words:

At no stage of the negotiation did French authorities take the initiative or make suggestions that would justify historians in denouncing their interference in American Church affairs and *a fortiori* their scheme for the enslavement of American Catholics. Their part in the whole affair was one of generous cooperation with the plans of Rome in a spirit of friendliness to their allies and their fellow-Catholics in the United States (page 174).

The first initiative came from Rome, from the Prefect of the Propaganda. The secrecy observed is explained as the necessary discretion for a project not yet assured; while the author maintains that Rome's apparent ignoring of the American clergy was due to her traditional unwillingness to deal directly with any save those in authority. In view of the fact that the break with the London Vicar Apostolic had already occurred, and that the existence of an organized body of clergy in the United States was an actual fact, this link in the refutation does not seem so strong, even in view of the letter sent by the Prefect to the "oldest missionary" through the French authorities. However, Barbé-Marbois, the French Chargé d'Affaires, appears exonerated of the blame that has attached to him. His character and that of Vergennes appear in a most favorable light. Father Baisnée seems to have successfully refuted the theory that there was necessarily an intrigue. He gives an open and honorable explanation to the events, which reflects honor upon France and involves no severe disparagement of the clergy in the United States. It does not, however, quite do away with the surmise as to whether Father Charles Plowden, John Carroll's intimate in England, was as misinformed as his letter of September 2, 1784, warning Carroll of the scheme and of the "uncommon secrecy" concerning it, would, under Father Baisnée's theory, make him out to be. Nor does it altogether dispel the uneasiness which arises at the sight of the negotiations of three such individuals as Cardinal Antonelli, fearful of the Jesuit restoration, the officious Franklin, and Talleyrand, notorious schemer, even though the existing record be clear. His argument does, however, call for a definite suspension of unfavorable judgment until the facts are better known; as well as for a better realization of the disinterestedness and zeal of the French Catholics. On page 134 a letter to Carroll from Father Thomas Talbot, Procurator in London, is erroneously attributed to Bishop Talbot, Vicar Apostolic of London. J. L. F.

Individualism and Socialism. By KIRBY PAGE. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. \$2.50.

The modern depression debacle has afforded splendid opportunity for all opponents of the capitalistic system to air their views and advance their theories for the amelioration of present-day living conditions. This volume proposes as a thesis that the present

economic order is intolerable and indefensible on economic, political, and moral grounds. The author, a clergyman, scathingly condemns Capitalism, which he identifies with Individualism, as inherently responsible for our modern plight, accuses the system of about every possible evil under the sun, holds it opposed to everything and denounced by everybody in any way worthwhile, claims that every time the Lord's Prayer is prayed *right* it becomes a petition for Capitalism's abolition, and demands that the halo of respectability be removed from it, and that it be excommunicated as a scourge of humanity. "To accept and defend its injustices and cruelties is to admit intellectual paralysis and moral bankruptcy." Well, so far as we know, nobody would attempt to accept, much less defend, its injustices and cruelties; does not seem to be logical to infer that unless you are willing to do that, you must do away with the system. The trouble with writers of this kind is that their conclusions are too broad for their premises, their generalizations too arbitrary for their facts. He claims that an economic and social revolution is imperatively necessary. He advocates a collectivist society, gives a detailed program of Socialistic deliverance, aims to answer the ordinary objections advanced against its theories, and, after a rather piquant criticism of the Constitution and Supreme Court as formidable barriers to radical social change, accuses modern religious leaders, "with conspicuous exceptions," as afflicted with ethical obtuseness, because of their apathetic attitude toward the cause he espouses. His final chapter, Religion and Socialism, is subject to all kinds of objections, and is, at times, ethically amusing. How much safer, surer, sanner the immortal Encyclicals of Leo and Pius!

J. A. L.

The Economy of Abundance. By STUART CHASE. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.

The power age, with its amazing capacity to satisfy material wants, has made possible an economy of abundance, says Mr. Chase. But the men in control of the industrial and financial systems still think in terms of the economy of scarcity; of profits and vendibility as the only goal of business, and scarcity or deficient supply, as its essential condition. That is why a hungry nation on its uppers sees its factories closed, its fields plowed under to combat abundance and create an artificial scarcity. But in our present state of complete economic interdependence, industry and agriculture must be operated on a standard of serviceability, else the community will starve or freeze. Socialization of at least those industries which have passed from a status of genuine scarcity is the only solution. Industry must work for the nation, not for the stock manipulator. This latest of Stuart Chase's works is easily his best. More than any of its predecessors it has restraint, solidity, perspective. If not exactly novel, it is an excellent condensation and clarification of what many writers are groping vaguely to express. The proposed solution can be criticized as unworkable, subordinating man to the State, infringing on other's rights, etc.; but it could not help improving on the present system. Anyway, quite apart from its thesis, the book gives us a straightforward exposition of the sources of the present crisis, and a mass of valuable, challenging data.

P. K.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The Russian Question.—The conflict between Communism and nationalism in the Soviet Union has received less attention in non-Russian lands than other phases of the Bolshevik struggle. Yet it is one of the main concerns of the present Soviet regime. With calm penetration, Hans Kohn, correspondent of the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, lays his finger on the essential contradictions between the Communist and the nationalist idea, showing how the present Soviet policies have been shaped with regard to national cultures, in "Nationalism in the Soviet Union" (Columbia University Press. \$2.50). Professor Kohn frankly admits that "the cultural nationalist policy of the Communist Party signifies . . . 'death to the national culture.'" He illustrates this from the en-

torced separation of Communist Jews from Judaism. The weakness in his argument lies in his concluding with the bald dilemma that there can be no supra-national force, no means of overcoming the intrinsic contradictions of nationalism, save Communism. The supra-national character of Christianity appears to be overlooked as well as its perfect reconciliation of the apparent antinomies.

Clearer and clearer the conflict between the basic ideas of Christianity and of Communism is being revealed by contemporary thinkers. Nicholas Berdyaev, the profoundly Christian, Orthodox student of Marxism, treats specifically of the Marxian concept of class and class war in his "Christianity and Class War" (Sheed and Ward, \$1.50). The power of Berdyaev's treatment lies in its deep appreciation of the appeal to certain elements of man's best that lies in Communism: not as an abstract system but as realized in Russia and adhered to by enthusiastic idealists. Hence the soberness of his exposition of the "mythology" of class warfare, the acuteness of his criticism, and the profound hopefulness of his solution.

In somewhat more militant tone than Berdyaev, H. G. Wood, Lecturer at the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, attacks, in "Christianity and Communism" (New York: Round Table Press, \$2.00), the philosophy of Communism particularly as it has affected British and American Protestant thought. "Marx the prophet," says Mr. Wood, "is probably greater and more important than Marx the scientific economist and social philosopher. But it is in the latter capacity that he himself elects to be judged," and is herein discussed. The leading ideas of Marxianism, such as the dialectic, are soberly discussed. Each, says the author, "contains an element of truth but . . . the elements of truth so disclosed do not constitute an adequate explanation of the vital movement of history, and do not account for the actual evolution of society." The author's "Christian social policy," outlined at the end, is good as far as it goes, but is philosophically too inadequate to grapple with the problems of the present order.

A Methodist Episcopal pastor, George Mecklenburg, in "Russia Challenges Religion" (New York, Abingdon, \$1.00), gives the results in his own case of three visits to that country. He is "puzzled and perplexed" (p. 112), but is constantly "challenged." The idea of being "challenged" seems to have gripped his imagination as did, he confesses, the magic word *liquidate*, so dear to the Bolsheviks. The attitude reflects a vague dissatisfaction with the condition of Protestantism, as a social force, in this country, rather than any intelligent criticism of the Russian system, whose statistics he finds "convincing." He is "challenged" by the Soviet industrialization of farms; but does not seem to reflect that recent American distrust of the system may be due to our increased practical sense.

If Alexander Wicksteed, British author of "My Russian Neighbors" (McGraw-Hill, \$1.75), confessed disciple of Walter Duranty, is, as he says (p. 205), "bored . . . by Communist propaganda," he must be wearied by his own writings, fluent and witty as is his pen. Professing merely to offer portraits of some of his Russian acquaintances, he sees to it that, as his cover blurb says, "one absorbs information" of the kind that he desires. Enthusiasm for the G. P. U., for everything that he can possibly find wherewith to free Western readers from the anti-Soviet "illusions" that afflict them, he finds nevertheless that Russia is bitterly committed to the class war, that the term *kulak* cannot be defined, and that discussion of moral standards had best be left out of the picture. Where does he get the idea, expressed on page 186, that the Soviet rulers "always respect" the feelings of national minorities?

Historical.—It is seldom that a collection of pictures has so perfectly preserved the atmosphere and general design along with all striking detail as we find in "The Official Pictures of a Century of Progress Exposition, Chicago, 1933" (R. H. Donnelley Corp., Chicago, \$5.00). The selection of views shows

good judgment and the photographic work of Kaufmann and Fabry is of the highest order. Many of the scenes are in color, and so perfectly reproduced that one is startled at the realism. It is an artistic achievement and a worthy souvenir of a great Fair in which light and color played such an important role.

Another volume which does justice to a national event is "Hoover Dam, Including the Story of the Turbulent Colorado River" (Hoover Dam Scenic Corp., Las Vegas, Nev. \$2.00). In every way the authors have tried to preserve the thrilling tale of this great adventure in subduing nature. The pictures are well chosen and printed from good plates. Each stage of the development is made vivid by photographs and intriguing narrative. Bound in stiff suede-cloth cover of green shade, the volume is very attractive, and should be a valued record for libraries and homes.

It is as a military man that Captain F. R. Mellor tells the story of "The Papal Forces" (Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, 2 shillings). This slight but well-illustrated brochure gives the history of the three arms of the Papal soldiery, from the founding of the cavalry by Innocent VIII in 1485. And if anyone should be so captiously critical as to ask why Vatican City, which could easily be pushed into a corner of New York's Central Park, should need an armed force at all, the answer is Captain Mellor's booklet; that the Papal Monarchy is the oldest State in Europe; and that the diminished area of the Vatican State of the 1929 Lateran Treaty bears no relation to the Temporal Dominions of the Church, to defend which the Papal army was originally founded. After four centuries or more of disreputation, it is encouraging to learn that Caesar Borgia was the most accomplished soldier who ever held the post of Commander-in-Chief of the armies of the Church.

Devotional.—Of timely interest on account of the centenary of the St. Vincent de Paul Society is the attractive little volume entitled "Virtue and Christian Refinement" (Herder, \$1.25), by Saint John Don Bosco. As the sub-title indicates, the book is arranged in a series of readings designed to provide a month's devotion to St. Vincent. In this appealing way a Saint proposes for admiration and imitation the virtues which rendered another Saint "Beloved of God and men, and his memory a benediction." The whole is prefaced by an epitome of the life of St. Vincent de Paul.

"Outline Addresses for the Three Hours Devotion" (Morehouse, 85 cents), by the Rev. Marcus Donovan, provides material for use on Good Friday. Though Protestant, it keeps almost entirely to such plain moral truths as could be urged by any Christian preacher, with the exception of such incidental ideas as the danger that comes to the Anglican church from its subservience to the government.

Nature Studies.—It is not necessary to be an ornithologist to enjoy every page of Rudyerd Boulton's "Traveling with the Birds" (M. A. Donohue Company, Chicago, \$1.50). This book, beautifully illustrated with colored plates by Walter Alois Weber, tells the story of bird migration and describes the migratory birds of North America. The language is clear, simple, and to the point; and the narrative is told with such a fascinating running commentary on bird life, that even the most dyed-in-the-wool city dweller will be unable to resist its charm, and will know which bird is which when he sees it. While not exactly a children's book, young readers will not find the narrative beyond their comprehension.

Books Received.—This list is published, without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

THE BOG. Patrick J. Carroll, C.S.C. \$1.50. Ave Maria Press.
CATHOLIC PLEA FOR REUNION, A. Father Jerome. 3/. Williams and Norgate.
HOBGOBLIN MURDER, THE. Kay C. Strahan. \$2.00. Bobbs-Merrill.
ORGANISATION PROFESSIONNELLE ET ACTION SOCIALE PATRONALE. L'Édition Universelle.
PAPAL REVENUES IN THE MIDDLE AGES. William E. Lunt. \$12.50. Columbia University Press.

Death on the Diamond. Once a Wilderness. The Riddle of the Russian Princess. Jenny Rorke.

As indicated by its title, "Death on the Diamond" (Stokes, \$2.00), by Cortland Fitzsimmons, is a clever baseball story. But it is very much more than a mere story. It is a study of human emotions reacting to the stimuli of hope and terror. The forthright methods of racketeers and the more adroit deceptions of men possessing highly trained intelligences are expertly analyzed and contrasted. Meanwhile, amid the restless curiosity and ghoully morbidity of the expectant mob, an intensive search for the real criminals is carried on by a young newspaper reporter. Urged by the double motive of suspicion from his friends and threats upon his life by the actual criminals, because of his seemingly excessive knowledge, this upright and keen young reporter through his own natural ability ultimately exposes the murderers and drags them to the bar of justice. The scientific intricacies of what is known as "inside baseball" will furnish interested "fans" with many a thrill; and the twitchings of conscience experienced by old "Pop" who under circumstances utterly beyond his control was compelled to "throw a game," a thing he had never done in his long career as manager, will evoke sympathetic understanding and approval from all. The shooting of the returning pigeon which occasions the climax of the story, and thereby ends further human tragedies, is a morally fitting way of closing this excitingly entrancing tale of our national game.

"Once a Wilderness" (Reynal and Hitchcock, Inc. \$2.75), by Arthur Pound, is the saga of Captain John Mark and of the Mark farm in Michigan. Of the many novels of the "back-to-the-land" genre, this is one of the better ones. With the exception of one or two blemishes of over-realism, it contains much excellent writing and several good character portraits. Captain John, the second of his line to farm the Mark section, was a thoroughgoing progressive, although he did not believe in wearing a necktie. By long hard work and careful planning, he escaped the pitfall of mortgaging and took justified pride in the fruitfulness of his lands, which gave to him and his large family a very comfortable living. Flora, his unmarried daughter, though she inherited her father's love of the farm, plunged into the then rising suffrage movement. Clayton Gale, his grandson, was lured by the newly born automobile industry for a time but toward the end he, too, drifts back to the Mark lands. This is a novel of people who lived life fully although not too decently. The Marks are a proud race, hence their falls from grace are frequent, but nevertheless they are interesting people to meet.

Russian flavor has become quite popular in the titles and themes of the modern literary world. It is used to very good advantage in E. S. Liddon's "The Riddle of the Russian Princess" (Doubleday, Doran. \$2.00). After a brief introduction to the main and mysterious characters, the reader is made witness to a beach quarrel, followed by a sinister murder, and the subsequent unraveling of a series of clues guaranteed to keep one right on edge to the very end of the story. Peggy, who undertakes the solution of the mystery on her own initiative, is the brains of the plot, and her glorification is accomplished at the expense of the district attorney, police, and male detective force. As a matter of fact the latter are made to appear real novices by contrast. We wonder just how much good is accomplished by this belittling, intentional or otherwise, of the established police powers of the country. The book is intriguingly interesting, and should prove welcome to the large number of detective story lovers.

In "Jenny Rorke" (Appleton. \$2.00), Muriel Hine tells the story of an Englishwoman who, after an unfortunate love affair, feels a resentment toward men and a critical attitude toward the dispensations of God. Although she attempts to emancipate herself from the Victorian traditions of her family, she can never completely shake them off, and is consequently unhappy. Finally she meets and marries a kindly, broadminded man, and life begins to take on a new meaning. Miss Hine's style is pleasant and easy to read.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

"The War Business"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Your leading article urging us to do our duty for peace by restricting the arms traffic is as helpful as it is timely. However, if the Catholics of this country are to do their part for peace, much more is necessary.

Ultra-nationalism is the war danger of today; and as prevalent in this as in other countries has been heartily condemned by our Holy Father. What we Catholics should strive for is to abate this *at home*. American ultra-nationalism is a menace to world peace chiefly through two channels: (1) a tariff policy based on burdening the many to (theoretically) benefit a small part of labor and a still smaller group of manufacturers; and (2) a restrictive immigration policy which, in effect, if not in words, tells Europe to sweat and starve, so that many Americans may have luxuries.

This is, of course, no plea for suddenly wide-open gates. But when we raise more food than we can export or consume, and when our idle agricultural land runs into additional millions of acres, I can see no moral right to shut out honest, God-fearing and serving immigrants—the real basis for the growth (such as it was) of this country in the past century. Also the infant industry plea may be a worthy one, but when for every penny of tariff revenue, an infant now grown to manhood mulcts the public of ten cents added living costs, it is unjust to the consumer at home, as to the producer abroad who is sweated and deprived of his natural market.

Once that was America's crime. But there is more today. We led the rest of the world with the example (1900 to 1930 in the tariff; 1921 to 1932 in immigration restriction). Now they have taken scandal from us and followed suit. The transoceanic barriers to world trade (tariffs, quotas, and embargoes) came after our 1922 Tariff Act. The restrictions upon foreign labor in most transoceanic countries (and worse, subsequent conditions reaching almost deportation, politely termed "repatriation") commenced about three years after our immigration restriction.

It is these acts which have separated peoples, raised hatreds, caused unemployment, starvation, and death; and in each country allowed local jingoes to feed the flames of un-Christian (and ultra) nationalism. It is by a successful combat against them in the future and rectifying the harm of the past that Catholics can best aid peace on earth. Stop the arms traffic by all means; but stop the causes and destroy the roots of wars as well.

Finally as to practical application: (1) Tariffs should be as low as possible, save perhaps for "infant industries." None for the latter should extend over twenty-five years at the utmost, and should commence to dwindle after ten years. Most of the tariff burdens of today are for the infants of the 90's and 00's. Most of these latter could thrive today without a tariff; and if they can't, rarely benefit the country upon whom they live. (2) This country can readily absorb each year several hundred thousand immigrants. They should by all means be selected. We neither need nor want ticket-of-leave men nor ex-Camorra's. There should be selectivity, too, from the occupational standpoint; and of course only immigrants of genuinely good character should be admitted and encouraged. The character of a people, not money, constitutes a nation's real wealth, just as sound morals are always sound economics. But—and here is the important question—will we learn before it is too late?

New York.

RICHARD KERENS KENNA.

Chronicle

Home News.—The Harriman Hosiery Mills, of Harriman, Tenn., on June 25 carried out its threat of closing down its mills if the Blue Eagle were not returned to them, and put 653 employes out of work. General Johnson had removed the Blue Eagle on April 20, because the officials of the mills refused to bargain collectively with employes. General Johnson on June 26 said the terms he had offered the company were extremely reasonable, and that the Blue Eagle would be returned on their acceptance. He also said that he had referred the case to the Department of Justice on June 20, for criminal or civil action, because the company had violated Section 7a of NIRA. The President on June 26 appointed a board to deal with the longshoremen's strike on the Pacific Coast. Archbishop Hanna was chairman of the board, and the other two members were Edward F. McGrady and O. K. Cushing. On June 27, General Johnson and other NRA officials answered the second Darrow report, Johnson calling it "even more inaccurate and inconsequential than the first." Federal Judge Barnes of Chicago granted an injunction on June 26 restraining the Government from enforcing the provisions of the AAA milk-licensing agreement against six independent milk dealers in the Chicago milk-shed area. He ruled, in effect, that the government had usurped powers which, under the Constitution, it had no authority to assume. The first national conference of automobile unions attached to the A. F. of L. on June 25 took the first step toward formation of an international union independent of the Federation's supervision, when it created the United Automobile Workers National Council. It has eleven members from the various States with local automobile unions. On June 21, Secretary Morgenthau ordered that all Treasury employes must drop political jobs if they wished to continue in office after September 1. President Roosevelt went to New London on June 21 to watch the Harvard-Yale regatta, and while there signed the amendment to the Railway Labor Law. After spending a few days at Hyde Park he returned to Washington on June 25, hoping to be able to leave on his one-month cruise to Hawaii on Saturday, June 30. On June 24, he allocated \$150,000,000 of the drought relief funds for use in the Northwest, where the rains had come too late to avoid ruin and threatened starvation in the corn and livestock-raising areas. On June 27, he personally instructed his aides to avoid "political" speeches, as he intended to, during his absence from Washington. He also approved 124 bills, and vetoed 31. On June 28, the President in a radio talk briefly sketched the accomplishments of the last session of Congress. To judge the success of his Administration so far, he asked the people of the country to consider their own situation, whether it had improved, and to what extent. He spoke of the need of social insurance in future plans, which he would talk about later in the year.

The Debts Controversies.—A British reply to the most recent American communication on the War-debts problem was received by the State Department in Washington on June 27. Payment in kind, the British Government maintained in its note, does not solve the difficulties of transfer. They suffer the same economic difficulties as cash payments. "The primary question for settlement is the amount that should be paid, having regard to the circumstances of these debts." In other words, the British stood by their demand for a lump-sum settlement. It was reported that no further reply would be sent by the United States. On June 22, Germany established a rationing system for foreign exchange which would limit her daily foreign payments to her daily foreign income. Dr. Schacht, President of the Reichsbank, threatened in a speech on June 21 to suspend all further intercourse with countries which established clearance systems to pay themselves out of the proceeds of German exports, Great Britain being principally considered.

British Defense Plans.—Every trace of pacifism disappeared from the scene when on June 21 at the preliminary talks in London on the future naval conference the British naval experts handed to Admiral Leigh, for the United States, a statement of British aspirations. They wished, said the statement, to change all the categories covered by the existing agreements, but stressed chiefly the demand for greater cruiser strength. Under the existing agreement Great Britain has only fifty cruisers. This would raise the number to seventy. It will be recalled that the controversy with the United States on this point was the outstanding feature of the former London naval conference. It appeared, however, in the present instance that the British were counting on the common cause of the United States against Japan's demands for naval equality in order to reconcile American sentiment to British cruiser growth. In Washington, however, disappointment over the British position seemed to prevail. A still more drastic blow was struck when on June 27 the Marquess of Londonderry, British Secretary of State for the Air, announced in the House of Lords that the Government had abandoned hope of the continuance of the World Disarmament Conference; and therefore must make provision for an adequate air defense. This would mean, since "adequate" was interpreted as "equal," that the number of British military planes would be doubled. To date the figures stood, of military planes: Great Britain, 850; France, 1,650; Russia, 1,150; United States, 1,100. Additional budget would be asked of Parliament for this purpose. A forward defensive zone of action, which would embrace the Low Countries, was said to be planned.

Britain's Trade War.—On June 26, the Emergency Bill (which gave the British Government power to seize Germany's funds in London if that country should default) passed the House of Commons. The bill, however, will remain inoperative if present negotiations in London are successful. The debate on the Bill in the House of

Commons showed that the Government was determined to carry out its threats. Opponents were conceded a last-minute compromise when the Government agreed to limit the operation of the Bill to two years. It was reported that the Bank of England and the leading financiers of the nation were fearful of German reprisals and favored a more conciliatory policy. Sir Herbert Samuel, leader of the Liberals, expressed the fear that counter-reprisals by Germany would result in a virtual embargo, with trade between the two countries coming to a standstill. Neville Chamberlain charged Germany with bad faith in wilfully manipulating the reserves of the Reichsbank. He accused the German Government of advancing foreign exchange to German exporters, to enable them to purchase German bonds abroad, while at the same time the Reichsbank pleaded inability to find exchange to meet its obligations. The German Government's reply to the British note on the transfer problem regretted the coercive measures adopted by Great Britain and stated that corresponding counter-measures would be employed to protect business interests at home.

Mexican Events.—Elections were to be held on July 1 for the election of a President, a new Chamber of Deputies, half the Senate, and several State Governors. The dominant National Revolutionary party was expected to sweep the elections. The War Department on June 22 announced the stationing of small troop detachments in all villages presumably to prevent disorders. On June 23, the Associated Press stated that a semi-military "gold-shirt" organization was being developed in Mexico City by former army officers. Its immediate aim was the driving out of Mexico of all Jews, Chinese, and other "undesirable foreigners." It had been in the process of formation for three years, and is estimated to have 66,000 members. At Villa Hermosa, in Tabasco, two widows and two girls were arrested and held in jail for ten hours, because they had visited a cemetery to put flowers on the grave of the husband of one of the widows. They were finally released on the payment of fines. A recent decree by the Governor provided that all tombstones must be removed from cemeteries, and all graves be without any sacred adornment or flowers.

German Conservatives Oppose Extremists.—Conservative opposition to the radicalism of Propaganda Minister Goebbels and Capt. Ernst Roehm, chief of staff of the Storm Troops, was strengthened by the latter's failure to secure the dissolution of the Stahlhelm War veterans' organizations. Radical leaders had seized upon a stabbing affray in Pomerania as an excuse for announcing that "the further existence of the National Socialist Front Fighters' League as a unit, or even as a militant association, appears no longer bearable." Franz Seldte, Minister of Labor and chief of the War veterans' group, finding that the knifing affair was due to a private feud of long standing between a local Stahlhelm leader and the local Nazi leader, sprang to the defense of the conservative organization and was upheld by Chancellor

Hitler. Added significance was attached to the decision because it was the first which Herr Hitler had been called upon to make since Colonel von Papen's speech at the University of Marburg. At the same time, it was announced that the Nazi Storm Troops would be given a vacation during July, during which time they would not engage in maneuvers or wear their uniforms. After that, it was thought that their service requirements would be greatly curtailed. July will also mark a respite in Dr. Goebbels' campaign against "killjoys, critics, and grumblers." In the meantime, there was no improvement in Germany's financial or economic status. The Reichsbank's gold ratio declined to 2.3 per cent, the lowest figure since the War. The acute need for raw materials was reflected in an order issued in the Ruhr instructing all housewives to save rags, old paper, and scrap metal for delivery to licensed collectors. The situation was most serious in the textile, leather, and electrical industries. Fear of further import restrictions induced consumers to stock up on coffee, clothing, and household goods. There was continued talk of "Ersatz," or substitute materials, and of the possibility of a new "hunger blockade." Hopes for the bumper harvests of previous years had practically faded out of the picture. Nor was the Church situation eased. On the Protestant front, in spite of reports that both Reichbishop Mueller and his law steward, August Jager, would resign, it appeared that they would be given until Luther Day, October 31, to demonstrate their power to unite the sect. Catholics were heartened by the exhortation of Bishop Bares of Berlin to regard Christ as their only "Fuehrer" or leader. It was not a good omen that Dr. Robert Ley, chief of the Nazi labor organization, and Baldur von Schirach, head of Hitler Youth, both outspoken representatives of the extremist wing of the Nazi party, were appointed by the German Government to confer with the Catholic Bishops on the interpretation of the Concordat between Church and State.

Pay Checks in the Peninsula.—Although, curiously enough, the Spanish press saw nothing funny in the incident, American readers were vastly amused over the collapse of the Esquerra's recent gesture of protest. Two weeks ago, the Left Catalans stalked from the Cortes chamber in protest against Madrid's veto of a Catalan land law. It was a dramatic gesture and aroused Spanish respect. But at present writing the Esquerra deputies had changed their minds and were scrambling to get back to their deserted seats. Reason: an announcement that striking deputies forfeit their salaries for each day that they remain outside the sessions. During this interlude Premier Samper was at work on a formula with which to settle the states' rights dispute and yet save feelings in the northeast. On June 25 his solution was close to acceptance. While maintaining the constitutional right at issue, the Premier offered to present a bill on land contracts that would satisfy tenants, owners, and regional pride in Catalonia. On June 24 it was announced that the Cortes would probably adjourn for a summer holiday until October 1. At the same time the state of alarm

which (with press censorship) had been in effect for several months, was lifted by the Cabinet.

French Pledges to Little Entente.—Wild enthusiasm greeted the dramatic appearance and statements of Louis Barthou, French Foreign Minister, in the capitals of Rumania and Yugoslavia. In Bucharest M. Barthou pledged the whole power of France against any attempt to interfere with Rumania's frontiers. Speaking at a plenary session of the Skuptchina, Yugoslav Parliament, in Belgrade on June 26, M. Barthou replied with cordiality to the declaration of Premier Uzunovich against any form of revision and characterized the Yugoslavian union as a matter of Divine right. Indignant comments from Hungary followed M. Barthou's utterances on both occasions, Hungarians looking upon them as a blow to any hope of treaty revision. While the French press in general endorsed his action, some expressed anxiety that he was committing France's armies to a defensive alliance, rather than merely pledging security.

The Chaco War.—The two-year Chaco War saw its bitterest fighting towards the end of June. Though reports from La Paz and Asuncion differed in estimating the victories, defeats, and casualties, each side claiming gains as a result of the several battles, it would appear that the Bolivians had somewhat the upper hand. However, the general result was that no material changes in the military positions of the combatants had taken place. Reports of an important victory by Bolivian troops in the Conchita-Condado sector east of Fort Ballivian with more than a thousand Paraguayan soldiers killed were denied by the Paraguayan War Office, which in turn announced that the Paraguayans were continuing their victorious advance toward the fort and that the week's dead and wounded among the Bolivians were estimated between 2,000 and 2,500. For the same period the Bolivian War Office estimated the Paraguayan dead at 2,900. Despite Paraguay's announcement that mediation would not be accepted, Santiago de Chile and Rio de Janeiro continued to report diplomatic conversations towards a new offer of good offices by the ABCP group and Colombia.

Government Crisis in Cuba.—Cuban disorders, provoked by the decision of the ABC to withdraw from the Government, reached a crisis on June 25 when the Cabinet presented its resignation to President Mendieta. The resignations of the four ABC members were accepted; the others temporarily not acted upon. Meanwhile, a reorganization by the President was forecast, with neutrals filling the vacant portfolios of the Interior, Justice, and Labor. Subsequently, President Mendieta publicly declared that the withdrawal of the ABC organization from the Government had not seriously hampered the normal progress of affairs of State. "The Government feels," he said, "that the retiring group will continue to be friendly, and although the ABC has withdrawn its collaboration I believe this to have been the result of internal

matters in the organization." In support of their ABC heads several hundred Government employees also resigned.

Kiev Again Capital of Ukraine.—The Soviet Government decreed on June 23 that the city of Kiev, ancient capital of the Ukraine and mother-city of Russian civilization and religion, should be restored to its former dignity, in place of Kharkov, which has been the capital under Soviet rule. This was in accordance with the Soviet claim that "counter-revolutionary activities" in the Ukraine had been successfully liquidated.

Fresh Bombings in Austria.—The first serious outbreak of violence in Austria since the Venice conference of Chancellor Hitler and Premier Mussolini took place on June 28, the fifteenth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Versailles. Explosives were set off or damage attempted in at least fifteen different places, while in many localities railway, telephone, and telegraph lines were cut with a consequent disorganization of communications and traffic. Although the disorder seemed to be concentrated in the Tyrol, Salzburg, and Voralberg Provinces, bombs were also exploded in Styria and Upper Austria. In Vienna there were only minor explosions. At Innsbruck a bomb was found near a Catholic publishing house, where *Tyrolia* is printed. Electric power stations, including the great Achensee power plant, which serves the electric railroads in the Tyrol, were a favorite object of attack. Fortunately, the train that carried Louis Barthou, French Foreign Minister, from Belgrade to Paris and traversed more than 500 miles of Austrian territory, was studiously avoided by the bombers. In general, there was evident a desire not to harm human lives, although the widespread character of the violence indicated a concerted plan and action. In spite of internal unrest, indications were that Chancellor Dollfuss had greatly strengthened his hold on the Government by his excellent relations with foreign States which regard him as the only bulwark against the Nazi wave that threatens to sweep over Austria. Rumors that he would be replaced by Anton Rintelen, Austrian Minister to Rome, proved unfounded. Friendly relations between Rome and Vienna were emphasized by the invitation of Premier Mussolini to the Austrian Chancellor to share his vacation in Riccione.

Continuing his series on "How It Is Done" Hilaire Belloc will next week take up new points in "How Official History Lies."

As an aid to understanding the present Catholic campaign against bad movies, Gerard B. Donnelly will summarize next week some of the salient facts about the films themselves.

In his next article on Catholic Action in its technical aspects, James D. Loeffler will deal in detail with the "Effectives and Objectives" of Catholic Action.

In a story of an encounter in Lisbon John Gibbons will tell what happened to him on "A Puritan's Day Out."